UC-NRLF
B 4 089 965

# CHAPTERS ON ENGLISH

# CHAPTERS ON ENGLISH

*(RE-PRINTED FROM "PROGRESS IN LANGUAGE")*

BY

OTTO JESPERSEN, PH.D., LITT.D.

PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH IN THE UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN
AUTHOR OF "HOW TO TEACH A FOREIGN LANGUAGE," "GROWTH AND STRUCTURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE," "A MODERN ENGLISH GRAMMAR" "LEHRBUCH DER PHONETIK," "PHONETISCHE GRUNDFRAGEN"
ETC.

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD.
RUSKIN HOUSE 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C. 1
1918

PE1075
J47
1918
MAIN

# PREFACE

When the publishers told me that a reprint of *Progress in Language with Special Reference to English* (1894, second edition—practically without any changes, in 1909) was again called for, I thought it not advisable to issue the book once more in its former shape. It has always been to some extent prejudicial to the book that it was made up of two really distinct treatises: (1) chapters i.-v. and ix., dealing with questions of general philology, the development and origin of language, and (2) chapters vi.-viii., dealing with some special points in the history of English. It is true that the two parts were by no means incompatible, in so far as the general view of linguistic progress had influenced the way in which English grammar was treated in the special chapters, and inversely the results gained in these formed part of the evidence on which



301

the general conclusions were based. Still, it could not be supposed that everybody interested in the general problems of philology would care equally for subtleties of English grammar, nor, on the other hand, that students of English would like to buy a book, half of which was only loosely connected with his special field of interest. I have therefore thought it best now definitely to separate the two parts, the more so as the time that has elapsed since the first publication of my book has affected them in different ways. While, namely, so much has been written of late years on general linguistics that parts of the book, more particularly perhaps the controversial portions, may now seem a little out of date, the same cannot be said about the English chapters. Indeed, I see no inconvenience in reprinting them from the old plates, even though I should now, of course, be able to add much illustrative matter, and though it would be possible now to refer to some new treatises and new editions of standard works. Very little would, however, be gained by such changes, and I have, consequently, refrained

from any changes except those necessitated by the new numbering of chapters and sections.

The rest of *Progress in Language* I shall try to re-write so as to make it a better and fuller expression of my views on the origin and development of language as they have matured during long years of thought and study.

OTTO JESPERSEN.

UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN,
*August*, 1917.

# CHAPTERS ON ENGLISH.

# CHAPTER I.

## ENGLISH CASE-SYSTEMS, OLD AND MODERN.

**1.** (103) The arrangement of inflexions current in grammars, according to which all cases of the same noun, all tenses, persons, etc., of the same verb, are grouped together as a paradigm, is not a truly grammatical one: what is common to Old English *dæg—dæge—dæges—dagas—dagum—daga*,—for instance, is not the flexional element, but the word, or stem of the word; the tie between all these forms, accordingly, is not of a grammatical, but of a *lexical* character. That such an arrangement may offer some advantages from a practical point of view cannot, indeed, be denied; but, on the other hand, it causes many things to be wrested from one another which belong together grammatically, *e.g.*, the termination *-um*, which is common to the dative plural of all the flexional classes. Besides, it forces us to separate from one another the two parts of grammar which treat respectively of the forms of words and of their uses. In the latter, we must needs deal with (say) all datives under one head, all genitives under another, and so forth, while in accidence these forms

are distributed according to declension classes. Such a disjunction, however, of accidence and syntax, beyond what is strictly necessary, is doubtless injurious to the right understanding of grammar. At any rate, this *paradigmatic* arrangement of grammatical phenomena will not answer the purposes of this chapter, where we seek to get as perspicuous a survey as possible of the grammatical forms of two distinct stages of one and the same language.

**2.** (104) Many works of comparative philology, however, employ another arrangement. In this each case is dealt with more by itself, so that either (as in Schleicher's *Compendium*) the accusative singular, for example, is treated separately in each language, or (as in Brugmann's *Grundriss*) the mode of formation of one definite case in one definite class of nouns (*i*-stems, etc.) is followed out through all the allied tongues. According to this arrangement all those facts are brought into a single class which are related to one another from the point of view of a student of comparative philology; but, as an inevitable consequence, the survey of the forms of any one language (or stage of language) is obscured; the unity of time and place is effaced; and, moreover, we get only a formal conception of the phenomena. The morphological element has been brought to the front at the expense of the syntactical, which has to be treated in another section, so that the constant reciprocal action of form and function is generally lost sight of.

**3.** (105) Lastly, we come to what I will term the *purely grammatical* arrangement. The grammar of a language is, as it were, an answer to the question, What general means of expression does such and such a language possess?[1] Now, by the purely grammatical arrangement the methods of expression existing in a particular language at a particular time are tabulated in such a manner that those forms come together which are grammatically analogous. By this arrangement, forms which belong together from a dictionary point of view, *e.g.*, *dæg*, *dæge*, are wrested from one another, and the same may be the case with forms which belong together historically, *e.g.*, Old English nominative plural neuter *hof-u* and *word;* it is true that they were once formed with the same ending, but an Englishman of King Alfred's time could not possibly be aware of this point of agreement. Clearly by this mode of treatment the individual element, by which I mean that which is peculiar to each language or to each successive stage of language, is brought more distinctly into view; we are, moreover, enabled to survey the potentialities of development of each particular language: we see plainly where the differences between the various cases are so well marked that they can easily be kept distinct, and where they bear such a close resemblance to each other in form or function, or in both alike, as to run the risk of being levelled and blended.

In an ideal language it would be an easy matter to

[1] Cf. Sweet, *Words, Logic and Grammar*, p. 31.

carry out such an arrangement: since each modification of meaning would have its own expression, which would be constant for all cases and quite unambiguous, a separation of accidence and syntax would be precluded, *ipso facto;* whether we should say, the genitival relation is expressed by -a, or -a denotes the genitive, would be quite immaterial.

**4.** (106) Not so in the idioms actually existing or recorded with their countless freaks of chance and capricious exceptions. In Latin, for example, *-i* sometimes denotes the genitive singular, sometimes the nominative plural, and if, conversely, we ask how the genitive singular is formed, the answer will be: now by *-i*, now by *-is*, etc. Consequently, we get two different modes of arrangement, according as we take as our base

I. Analogies of form (such and such a termination expresses such and such a meaning)—the *morphological* classification,—

or,

II. Resemblances of function (such and such a relation is signified by such and such terminations)—the *syntactical* classification.

The two arrangements stand to one another as the two parts of a dictionary, in one of which the form (say, some German or French vocable) is given, and the signification sought (in other words, the English equivalent is appended): in the other, the meaning is the known quantity, and the appended part is the German or French term which was required to be known.

**5.** (107) Before attempting to give a synopsis, arranged upon these principles, of English case-systems at different epochs of the growth of the language, I have to premise with regard to *Old English* that, as a matter of course, I shall have to give, in the main, West-Saxon forms, though for a thorough understanding of the historical process of development of Standard English it would have been better if I had been in a position to avail myself of a Mercian, or, still better, a London grammar representing the language as spoken about the year 800. Again, in stating the function, I shall have to be very brief, and content myself with merely giving names, leaving it to the reader to understand by "dative" (for example)—not the notion of dative in itself, for such a notion has no existence, but—"Old English dative". For the particular use which English people of a thousand years ago made of their dative case, I must refer to the Old English syntax, which is, unfortunately, still to be written. In the present chapter I can give nothing but a skeleton-like scheme, which does not aim at completeness.

**6.** (108) It will not fail to meet with general approval that, in drawing up this scheme, I have followed SIEVERS'S excellent *Angelsächsische Grammatik* (2 Aufl., 1886). In accordance with my general views, however, as stated above, I shall differ from Sievers in paying much more regard than he does to what would naturally appear to King Alfred and his contemporaries as the significant element in

language: I shall have to separate word and case-ending, as far as this is feasible, in the same manner as the instinctive linguistic sense of that time would have done, regardless of the prehistoric condition of things. Old English *eage*, for instance, is historically, it is true, an *n*-stem; but for my present purposes I shall have to look upon it as consisting of *eag* + the nominative ending *-e*, the genitive being *eag* + *an*, and so on. We want a special term for this distinction; and I propose to call the substantial part of the word, felt as such by the instinct of each generation as something apart from the ending (*eag* in the example chosen), the *kernel* of the word, while *eagan* is the historic "stem". No doubt, in some cases it will depend on a more or less arbitrary choice, how much of the traditional form is to be treated as kernel and how much as ending. For instance, *eage* itself might be said to be the kernel, the genitive ending being *-n*, before which the *e* of the kernel is changed into *a*. This division would, however, seem to be unnatural for Old English; although so much must be granted, that in Middle English we must look upon *eie* (not *ei*) as the kernel, to which the ending *-n* is affixed in the nominative plural.[1]

The fact is, that along with the perpetual wearing away of words there is often an alteration in the feeling as to the relations of kernel and ending.

[1] In Old English *here* the kernel is *here*, but in *wine* it is *win*; cf. dative plural *herj-um* (written *hereum*, *herigum*, etc.), but *win-um*.

Now a little more, now a little less may be included in one or the other, exactly as when one generation considers the sound-combination *anaddere* as consisting of *a* + *naddere*, whilst the next looks upon it as *an* + *addere* (Modern English, *an adder*), or when *mine uncle* is transmuted into *my nuncle*.

**7.** (109) It will be seen that if Old English *eage* is said to be an *n*-stem, what is meant is this, that at some former period the kernel of the word ended in *-n*, while, as far as the Old English language proper is concerned, all that is implied is that the word is inflected in a certain manner. If, therefore, in the following pages, I shall speak of *n*-stems, *i*-stems, etc., it is only as designations for classes of declension. It follows, however, from my view that we are not properly entitled to put down, *e.g.*, *wyrm* as an *i*-stem, for by doing so we should fail to give a true picture of the real condition of things in the Old English period. If a modern linguist is able to see by the vowel-mutation (umlaut) that *wyrm* was an *i*-stem, an Englishman of that time could not have suspected any such thing, as the endings of the several cases of *wyrm* are identical with those of (the *o*-stems, *e.g.*) *dom*. When Sievers reckons *wyrm* among *i*-stems, or gives *sige* as an *es- os*-stem, he is writing for the benefit of those who take only a secondary interest in Old English grammar, and care chiefly for the way in which it reflects prehistoric phenomena. He is thinking little of those other students who make the first object of their investiga-

tion the mutual relations of the facts of a language at a definite historical epoch, and who go to the study of Old English partly for the sake of seeing the mechanism of this particular idiom as an organically connected whole, partly with a view to seeking in it the explanation of later developments of the English language.

**8.** (110) In the succeeding tabulations the following abbreviations are used :—

| | |
|---|---|
| n | = nominative |
| a | = accusative |
| d | = dative |
| i | = instrumental |
| g | = genitive |
| s | = singular |
| p | = plural |
| m | = masculine |
| f | = feminine |
| nt (or n) | = neuter |
| b | = words with original short (*b*rief) syllable |
| l | = words with original long syllable (long vowel or short vowel followed by long consonant) |
| *st* | = strong adjectival (pronominal) declension |
| *w* | = weak adjectival declension [1] |
| r | = rare |

[1] The declension of adjectives and pronouns is only mentioned when deviating from that of nouns.

E = early (Alfred inclusive)
L = late
WS = special West Saxon
N = North of England
S = Sievers's *Grammatik*.

Italicised letters indicate the stem (class of declension) :—*o* (words like *dom*, *hof*, *word*; by others termed *a*-stems), *i*, etc.; *c* = those consonantal stems which do not form part of some larger group, such as *n*, *r*. What is said about the *â*-class applies likewise to the *wâ*-stems with a long vowel or a diphthong preceding the *w* (S, § 259), so that, in mentioning *wâ*, I only mean those in which the *w* is preceded by a consonant (S, § 260); the *jâ*-stems are only referred to when they present deviations from the other *â*-stems (g p); *abstr.* = words like *strengu* (S, § 279). n a p n *o*b must be read: nominative and accusative plural of neutral *o*-stems consisting of an originally short syllable.

## I. MORPHOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION.

**9.** (111) The Old English language used the following formal means to denote case-relations :—

### A. THE KERNEL OF THE WORD UNCHANGED.

(1) n a s. *o*, *jo* (except lm), *wo*, *i* (l)f, *u* lmf, *r*, *nd*, *c* mn, *c* lf [dom hof word, here secg cyn(n) rice westen, bearu searu (beadu), ben, feld hond, fæder modor, freond, fot scrud, boc].—Also N *i* b [wlit, S, § 263, anm. 5].

(2) n s f. (not a s.) *â* l, *jâ* (*wâ*) [ar, sib(b) gierd (beadu)]; L also *i* (l)f [ben], *-e* being used in a s.

(3) d s. some *o* [(æt) ham, (to) dæg and a few more, S, § 237, anm. 2], of *r* only fæder sweostor; r. *u* lf [hond] and *s* [dogor S, § 289]; L *c* lf [ac, etc., S, § 284, anm. 2].

(4) g s. *r*[1] [fæder broðor, etc.]; r. L *u* lf [hond].

(5) n a p. *o* ln, *jo* bn, *wo*, *c* n [word, cyn(n), searu, scrud]; also, though not exclusively, some *r* [broðor dohtor[2] sweostor], *nd* [freond hettend], *c* m [hæleð monað], *s* n [lamb for lambru by a complete transition to the *o*-class].

## B. VOCALIC ENDINGS.

### 10. (112) —*a*.

(1) n s m. *n* [guma; N also f]; L *u* b [suna].

(2) a s m. L *u* b [suna].

(3) d s. *u* [suna[3] felda[4] dura[3] honda[5]], also often words in *-ung* [leornunga, S, § 255]; also mæda, S, § 260.

(4) g s. *u* bm, f [suna,[6] dura honda; r. lm felda[6]].

(5) n a p. *u* bm [suna],[7] f [dura[3] honda]; r. *u* lm [only hearga[7] appla[7]]. — *i* lm r. [leoda]. — *â* [giefa[4]

[1] L also *-es*, which appears perhaps first in compounds (heahfæderes, Sweet, *A. S. Reader*, 14 b, 136).

[2] *Oros.*, 126, 7, Laud MS., his II dohtor, Cott. MS., his twa dohtra.

[3] L superseded by *-n*.

[4] L superseded by *-e*.

[5] L superseded by—(the kernel without any addition).

[6] L superseded by— *-es*.

[7] L superseded by *-u -as* (*-an*).

ara[1]], also instead of *-e* in *i* lf and *abstr.* [bena, strenga].—And finally L *o* bn [hofa, S, § 237, anm. 5].

(6) g p. wherever the ending is not -ana, -ena, -ra, see below [doma[2] hofa[2] worda,[2] her(i)g(e)a secg(e)a enda cynna ric(e)a westenna, bearwa searwa, giefa[2] ara,[2] sibba gierda, beadwa mædwa, win(ige)a spera, bena, suna felda dura honda (strenga?), fota scruda hnuta boca fæd(e)ra freonda] ; r. *n* [bæcistra, S, § 276, anm. 1]. *-a* is also found in g p. in neutral adjectives when used as substantives [goda], *Cosijn Altws. Gr.*, ii., § 49.

**11.** (113) *—e.*

(On *i* for classical O. E. *e*, see S, §§ 132 f, 237 anm. 2, 246 anm. 1, 252 anm. 1, 263 anm. 1, 269 anm. 2.)

(1) n a s. *jo* lm [ende], *i* bmn [wine spere] bf [only dene[3]], *jâ* r. [-nisse -nysse, generally -nes], *n* nt [eage].

(2) n s. *n* f [tunge[3]] ; N also r. m.

(3) a s. *â* [giefe are] ; *abstr.* [strenge] ; L also *i* lf [bene[4]].

(4) d (i) s. (on the difference between the older instr. in *-i* (*-y*) and the dative in *-ae*, see Sievers, *P. B.*

[1] L superseded by *-e*.

[2] N and L also (*-ana*), *-ena*, sometimes also *-na* [larna].

[3] L superseded by *-n*.

[4] The same difference between E and L as in *i* lf seems to hold with *wâ* l ; cf. *Orosius*, the older MS. (Laud, Sweet's ed., 92, 15), gelice and mon *mæd* mawe, the younger (Cott., Bosworth's ed., 51, 23), gelice and mon mæde mawe. Platt, *Anglia*, vi., 177, knows only the acc. *mæde*.

*Beitr.*, viii., 324 f.; in classical O. E., this distinction is no more found)—everywhere except *u* and *n* and the rest of consonantic stems, where, however, *-e* begins to crop up (S, §§ 273 anm. 2, 274 anm. 1, 280 anm. 2, 281, 286). Accordingly *-e* is found, *e.g.*, in [dome hofe worde, her(i)ge secge ende cynne rice westenne, bearwe searwe, giefe are, sibbe gierde, headwe mæd(w)e, wine spere, bene, strenge; felde for older felda, r. dure nose flore eage fote freonde].—Also neutr. adj. used as substantives [gode], *Cosijn*, ii., § 49.

(5) i s. distinct from d s. only in some pronouns and *st* adj. [micle]; it occurs comparatively seldom, see *Cosijn*, ii., §§ 38-48.

(6) g s. *â* [giefe are], *i* lf [bene], *abstr.* [strenge], *c* bf [hnute] lf [burge boce, etc., used concurrently with mutated forms; ace muse and others without mutation, S, § 284, anm. 1]; r. *u* f [dure S, § 274, anm. 1].

(7) n a p. *i* bm [wine[1] -ware], lm a few words [Engle], lf [bene[2]], thence also *â* [giefe are]; *st* m(f) [gode], also *nd* polysyllabics [hettende, besides -nd, -ndas].

(8) Mutated d s. og n a p. *c* bf [hnyte].

**12.** (114) *—u.*

(On *-o* see S, §§ 134 f, 237 anm. 4 and 5, 249, 252, 269 anm. 2 and 5, 279.)

(1) n s. *u* b [sunu duru]; *â* b [giefu], *abstr.* [strengu], *c* bf [hnutu].

[1] Superseded by *-as*. [2] Also *-a*.

(2) a s. *u* b [sunu duru] ; L *â* b and *abstr.*, S, §§ 253 anm. 2, 279.

(3) d s. *u* b [sunu duru ; generally -a], *â* b and *abstr.* as in (2).

(4) g s. L *â* b and *abstr.* as in (2).

(5) n a p n. *o* b [hofu ; L also l : wordu, see on polysyllabics, S, § 243], *jo* l [ric(i)u] and polysyllab. [westen(n)u], (*wo*: *u* for *-wu*, searu), *i* b [speru], similarly *st* b which have however often -e from m [hwatu].

n a p m f *u* b L [sunu duru] ; *r* [broðru dohtru, which form also other plurals].

(6) (i s. horu Elene 297 from horh.)

### C. NASAL ENDINGS.

### 13. (115) —*um.*

(1) d s. *st.* [þiosum, godum]. —? miolcum, heafdum, see Kluge, *Pauls Grundr.*, i., 386.

(2) d p. everywhere [domum hofum wordum, her(i)gum secg(i)um endum cynnum ric(i)um westennum bearwum searwum, giefum arum, sibbum gierdum, nearwum, winum sperum Englum, benum, sunum feldum durum hondum, gumum[1] tungum eagum, strengum, fotum hnutum bocum, fæd(e)rum, freondum, lombrum L lambum].

On -an, -on for -um see § 14.

—*m.*

(1) d s. pron. [him ðæm hwæm].

(2) d p. in some words after a vowel, for -um

[1] R -num : oxnum, nefenum, S, § 277, anm. 1.

[cneom beside cneowum, S, § 250, nr. 2; fream, etc., S, § 277, anm. 2], numerals [twæm þrim].

**14.** (116) *—an (—on).*

(1) d g s. and n a p. *n* [guman tungan eagan].

(2) a s. *n* m. and f. [guman tungan].

(3) n s. L weak adj.

(4) for *-um* L.

(5) g p. r. L [eastran, S, § 276, anm. 1; weak adj. § 304, anm. 2].

*—n*

for -an in some words after a vowel [frean, etc., S, § 277, anm. 2; beon tan, S, § 278, anm. 2].

**15.** (117) *—ena* [N *ana*].

g p *n* [gumena tungena eagena]; L also in *o* and *â*, especially b [carena, S, § 252, anm. 4], not *jâ*.

*—na.*

g p in a few words [sceona, etc., S, § 242, anm. 2. N treona, § 250, nr. 2; Seaxna, etc., § 264; *n* l after r and g: larna eagna, § 276, anm. l, oxna, § 277, anm. l, gefana Sweona, § 277, anm. 2].

**16.** (118) *—ne.*

a s m. pron. [hi(e)ne þone þi(o)sne hwone] and *st* [godne].

## D. ENDINGS CONTAINING *S*.

**17.** (119) *—as.*

n p m. *o* [domas], *jo* [her(i)g(e)as endas], *wo* [bearwas], *u* l [feldas], *r* only fæderas; becomes moreover frequent in *i* [winas], *u* b [sunas], *nd* [also -ras: wealdendras, S, § 286, anm. 2].

(G s. in -as r.; perhaps Beowulf, 63, 2453, 2921.)

**18.** (120) *—es.*

(1) g s m n. *o* [domes hofes wordes], *jo* [her(i)ges secges endes rices westennes], *wo* [bearwes searwes], *u* l [feldes], *nd* [freondes hettendes], *c* m [fotes]; -es becomes frequent in *u* b [sunes], *n* [eages eares], *r* [fæderes]; N also in most other stems.

(2) n a p. for -as L, S, § 237, anm. 3.

*—s.*

g s. very rare : eas (*Oros.*, 17, 23; *Chron.*, 896, 918, 919, 922) cus, S, 284, anm. 4, sæs, S, § 266, anm. 3 (also n a p).

E. OTHER ENDINGS.

**19.** (121) *—ra.*

g p. p r o n. [hiera (heora) þara], *st.* [godra], *nd* polysyll. [hettendra];[1] = r + a : *s* n [lombra cealfra, etc.; cildra also in texts which in n p have cild].

*—re.*

g d s f p r o n. [þære þisre], *st.* [godre].

*—or, —ru.*

n a p n *s* [lomber, see Schmidt, *Pluralb.*, 149, lombru [2]].

*—rum.*

d p n *s* in the same words as -ru.

*—ð*

might be considered a case-ending in hæleð, monað, ealoð, d g s, n a p; but the words are generally inflected regularly.

[1] Also the numerals tweg(r)a þreora.

[2] Superseded by —, (-as).

F. CHANGES IN THE KERNEL.

**20.** (122) *I-mutation*

is the only one of these changes which becomes a case-sign, namely in

(1) d s. *c* [fet[1] teþ men(n), bec[1] byr(i)g, ie,[1] etc.], *r* [breðer meder dehter], *nd* [friend[1]].

(2) g s. *c* lf [bec,[2] etc., ie[2]], *r* r. f [meder dehter].

(3) n a p. *c* [fet teþ men(n), bec ges byr(i)g], *nd* [friend[3]].

G. A TOTALLY DIFFERENT KERNEL.

Frequent in *pron.* [ic—me—wit—unc—us, etc.; se—þone, etc.].

**21.** (123) Those were the means used in Old English to denote case-relations; but we have not in our lists mentioned all the changes undergone by Old English words, for alongside of these significative changes we find a great many others which do not play any part in distinguishing cases. I shall briefly indicate the most important of these incidental changes.

(1) I-mutation, in isolated cases of i s. *o* [hwene, æne, S, § 237, anm. 2], in d s. *c* bf [hnyte] and r. *u* [dyre]. Where the i-mutation is found through all cases as in *cynn*, it does not concern us here.

[1] Unmutated forms are also used: fote boc, etc.; as for ea, note, *e.g.*, *Oros.*, L. 14.28, from þære ie = C. 18.21, from þære ea; L. 174.3, neah anre ie = C. 84.32, neah anre ea.

[2] Also unmutated forms: boce etc.; cf. *Oros.*, L. 16.6 ie = C. 18.36 ea.

[3] Also unmutated freond.

(2) U-mutation, *o* n a d p n [gebeodu from gebed; it disappears at an early period, leaving perhaps but one trace, in the differentiation of *cliff* and *cleeve*, see Murray's *Dict.* and my *Studier over Engelske Kasus*, § 198]; other instances of u-mutation, see S, §§ 241, 253, anm. 1, *Cosijn*, ii., p. 3 (cneoht); comp. also cucu, cwices, Sievers, *P. B. Beitr.*, ix., 259.

(3) Interchange of *æ* and *a*, found with greatest phonetic regularity in st. adj. [hwæt, hwates hwate], while in the nouns (of the *o*-class) *æ* is carried through in the singular and *a* in the plural [dæg, dæges—dagas]. After a palatal consonant we have the peculiar change seen in geat, gatu, which is by-and-by levelled out in different ways. Note also gærs, grasu. For the still more complicated change in magu mægce(s), plural mægca(s) magum, see Kluge, *Literaturblatt f. germ. u. rom. Philol.*, 1889, 134, and Paul's *Grundriss*, i., 368.

(4) Interchange of long *æ* and long *a*: mæg, magas; in ān ænne, long *a* and short *æ* interchange.

(5) Interchange of single and double consonant: cyn, cynnes, S, § 231; in the nominative cynn is also found, and it is not easy to see if the difference is only a graphical one or indicates a real difference in pronunciation. There is a tendency to utilise the difference for sense-distinguishing purposes in *mann*, "man," and *man*, corresponding to French *homme—on*, or still more closely to Danish *mand*, *man*, see *Cosijn*, ii., p. 47.

(6) Interchange between final voiceless and medial-

voiced consonants: wulf, wulves (written wulfes), hus, huze (written huse), bæþ baðas; see my *Studier over Engelske Kasus*, § 193 ff.

(7) The related interchange between *h* and *g*: beah, beages; *h* also interchanges with *w*: horh, horwes, the adj. ruh, ruwes (old "grammatical change," determined by Verner's law), and finally there is often an interchange between *h*-forms and forms with no consonant, but with contractions and perhaps lengthening of the vowel: furh, furum (? fūrum), sc(e)oh, sc(e)os, feoh, dative, feo. Here we very often see levellings, the *h*-less form being as a rule generalised.

(8) Interchange between forms with and forms without *w*: treo, treowes, later on levelled both ways: treo, treos; treow, treowes; compare also sna(w), S, §§ 174, nr. 3, 250, anm. 1. The forms are differentiated in æ "law" and æw "marriage," S, § 269, anm. 3.

(9) Interchange between *e* or *i*, *u* or *o* and the corresponding vowel-like consonants *j* and *w*: here, herias, herigas, hergeas, herigeas; bearu, bearwas (L bearuw, bearuwas).

(10) Interchange between the advanced and palatalised open *g* in dæg and the back open *g* in dagas;[1] so also byrig, burgum. In the latter word

[1] The two consonants corresponded probably to the Danish sounds of *tiger* and *bage* respectively; see my description in *Articulations of Speech Sounds* (Marburg, 1889), § 106, and in *Dania* (Copenhagen, 1890), vol. i., p. 52, nr. 50, and p. 53, nr. 56.

we have four sound changes: (*a*) the vowel of the principal syllable; (*b*) the vowel of the svarabhakti-syllable, which is also often left out; (*c*) the voiceless and voiced consonants, see above sub 6 and 7; (*d*) the palatalised and unpalatalised consonants.

(11) Vowel change in unstressed syllables, due to an old gradation (ablaut): -ung, ingum (S, § 255, anm. 1; see however *Cosijn*, ii., pp. 21, 22); broðor, breðer; morgen, mergen; see, for instance, *Oros.*, L. 194, 12, on mergen = C. 92, 40, on morgen.[1]

(12) Interchange between a full vowel in final syllables and a weakened one in the middle of the word: rodor, roderas, S, § 129.

(13) Interchange between preserved and omitted weak vowel: engel, engles; deofel, deofles; see especially S, § 144. At a later period this leads sometimes to a differentiation of consonants, pointed out for *engel* by Napier, see the *Academy*, March 15, 1890, p. 188.

(14) Interchanging vowel quantity is probable before many consonant groups; an indubitable case in point is cīld, cildru.

**22.** (124) A comparison of Old English with Proto-Arian will show that a good many case-endings have been given up, and that similarly the change of accent and that of vowels (by gradation) have disappeared from the declension; nor does the Germanic interchange of consonants according to Verner's law play

[1] With regard to *mergen* see, however, Sievers, in *P. B. Beitr.*, viii., p. 331, against Paul, *ibid.*, vi., 242.

any part in the declension (compare, however, § 21, 7 and 11).[1] Wherever the Old English language shows traces of these phonetic changes, it is always so that one form has been carried through in all cases, so that the other is only shown by the corresponding word in other connected languages, or by other derivatives from the same root. See on these traces especially Joh. Schmidt in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, xxvi., p. 8 ff., and *Pluralbildungen der idg. Neutra, passim;* Kluge in Kuhn's *Zeitschr.*, xxvi., p. 92 ff.; and in Paul's *Grundriss*, i., p. 387 f.

**23.** (125) It is of greater importance to our subject to examine the extent in which cases which were distinguished either at an earlier stage of the language or in other Old English words, have coalesced in one and the same word. Such *coalescence of cases* is found very frequently, though sometimes the form which is identical with that used in another case is not the only one in use for that particular case.

(1) a s. = n s. in all words except (*a*) *â* [giefu ar, accusative giefe are]; from this class the distinction is transferred to *i* l [ben, bene, instead of the older ben, ben], while on the other hand the late O. E. levelling, by which for instance *lufu* comes to be used through the whole of the singular, obliterates the distinction. (*b*) *n* mf [guma tunge, accusative guman tungan]. (*c*) *pron.* and *st.* mf.

(2) d s. = n a s.: (*a*) in some *o*-stems in certain connexions [ham, etc., see § 9, 3], also treo and

[1] Compare also *studu, stupu;* see Sievers, *P. B. Beitr.*, ix., 249.

similar words. (*b*) *jo* l [ende rice]. (*c*) *i* mnb [wine spere]. (*d*) *u* b [suna and sunu; duru]. (*e*) fæder sweostor; also L r ac boc, etc.

(3) d s. = a s. besides the words mentioned under (2): *n* mf [guman tungan].

(4) instr. = dative everywhere except in some *pron.* and *st.* mn., even there not strictly distinguished.

(5) g s. = n s.: *r* [fæder broðor, etc.], r *u* bm [suna].

(6) g s. = a s.: *â*, *jâ*, *wâ* [giefe are sibbe gierde beadwe mæd(w)e], *n* mf [guman tungan], *r* [fæder, etc.]; L *i* lf [bene], *u* bm [suna].

(7) g s. = d s.: *â*, *jâ*, *wâ*; *i* lf [bene], *u* [suna dura honda, r. felda], *n* mfn [guman tungan eagan], *c* lf [bec, etc.], *r* [only fæder sweostor], *pron.* f [hiere þære þisse þisre], *st.* [godre].

(8) n p. = n s.: *o* ln [word], *jo* bn [cynn], *wo* n [searu], *i* bm [wine], *u* bm [suna and sunu], *u* bf [duru], *r*: broðor dohtor sweostor, *nd* [freond hettend].

(9) n p. = a s. besides those under (8): *n* mf [guman tungan], L also *â* [giefe, are], *jâ* [sibbe gierde], *wâ* [beadwe mæd(w)e], *i* lf [bene].

(10) n p. = d s.: *i* bm [wine], *i* lf [bene], *u* [suna and sunu, felda dura honda], *n* [guman tungan eagan], *c* [fet hnyte bec], *r*: sweostor, *nd* [friend hettende]; also L the f mentioned in the end of (9).

(11) n p. = instr. s.: *st.* m [gode].

(12) n p. = g s.: *u* [suna felda dura honda], *n* [guman tungan eagan], *c* lf [bec], *r*: broðor dohtor sweostor; L the same words as in (9) and (10); finally L m when -es came to be used for -as.

(13) a p. = n p., so that the numbers (8-12) apply also to a p; the only exceptions are: we—us(ic), ge—eow(ic).

(14) d p. = d s.: pron. [þæm þi(o)sum], *st.* [godum], also weak adj. [godan], S, § 304, anm. 3.

(15) g p. = n a s.: *u* bm L [suna].

(16) g p. = d s.: *u* [suna felda dura honda].

(17) g p. = g s.: *u* [suna felda dura honda].

(18) g p. = n a p. *â* [giefa ara], *jâ* [sibba gierda], *wâ* [beadwa mæd(w)a], *i* lf [bena], *u* [suna felda dura honda], *r*: dohtra.

**24.** (126) This list, which does not include indeclinabilia like *strengu*, shows that the chances of mistakes were pretty numerous in Old English declensions. Take the form *suna;* it may be any case, except only dative plural; *sunu* is everything except genitive (singular and plural) and dative plural; *dura* is everything except nominative, accusative singular and dative plural; *fæder* may be any case in the singular; so also *sweostor*, which may moreover be nominative or accusative plural; the only thing we can affirm on such forms as *guman* or *tungan* is that they are neither nominative singular, dative plural, nor genitive plural, and in a late text we cannot even be sure of that, and so on.

## II. SYNTACTICAL CLASSIFICATION.

**25.** (127) In the following survey of the manners in which the syntactic categories are expressed in Old English, I have not found it necessary to indicate

in each case which stems had each ending, as I should then have had to repeat much of what has been said above. A dash denotes the unchanged kernel; -a denotes the kernel with an *a* added to it; + means the mutated, or otherwise changed kernel; the most frequent forms or endings are printed in black type, the rare forms or endings are put in ().

*Nom. sg.* —; -a, -e, -u, (-an).
*pl.* **-as**, —, -an, -a, -e, -u, +, (-ru, -es), (-n, +e).
*Acc. sg.* —, -e, -u, -an, -ne, (-a, -n).
*pl.* **-as**, —, -an, -a, -e, -u, +, (-ru, -es), (-n, +e).
*Dat.* (*instr.*) *sg.* **-e**, -an, -re, +, —, -um, (-m, -a, -u, -n, -a), (+ e).
*pl.* **-um**, (-an, -m, -n, -rum).
*Gen. sg.* **-es**, -an, -e, -re, +, (-a, -n), (—, -s, -u).
*pl.* **-a**, -ena [-ana], -ra, (-na), (-an).

**26.** (128) The Old English language has no expressions for the following syntactic categories, which were found in the Arian parent speech: (1) the dual number; the only exceptions are *wit*, *unc*(*it*), *uncer* and *git*, *inc*(*it*), *incer;* the nouns *duru*, *nosu*, and *breost*, in which traces of the old dual have been found by comparative philologists, were no doubt during the whole of the Old English period, and perhaps even much earlier, felt as singulars, and *sculdru* as a plural; (2) the vocative case, unless one feels inclined to consider the use of the definite form of the adjective in *leofa freond*, etc., as a sort of vocative.[1]

[1] See Rask, *Det Gamle Nordiske Sprogs Oprindelse*, p. 215.

Finally, three or four cases have coalesced to form the Old English dative, the old instrumental being, however, in some words distinct from the dative.

---

**27.** (129) I now pass to a similar survey of the case-relations and their expression in MODERN ENGLISH, and must at once declare that I shall deal only with the really spoken language, taking no account of what belongs only to the written language, *e.g.*, the distinctions made between

gen. sg. *king's* nom. pl. *kings* gen. pl. *kings'*
*lady's* *ladies* *ladies'*.

The three forms sound alike, and the systematic difference now made between them is quite recent. Before the middle of the eighteenth century they were all of them written alike; thus we find for instance in the original editions of Shakespeare, *Kings*, *ladies*, for the three cases. The apostrophe was at that time used (without any regard to case-function) where a syllable was added in pronunciation (*Thomas's*), or where the spelling *-es* was still commonly used, the apostrophe being then used to indicate that no new syllable was to be pronounced (compare the modern spelling *stabb'd*); in Shakespeare you will find, *e.g.*, *earth's* as a genitive singular and *prey's* as a nominative plural. Sometimes the apostrophe is even in our days used before the plural ending; thus in Shake-

Rask's identification of the ending *-e* in Danish *gode gud* with the Latin and Greek vocative ending is, of course, wrong, but that does not make his syntactical observation less correct.

speare's *Twelfth Night* (ii., 5, 96) the spelling "her very *C's*, her *U's*, and her *T's*" is kept unchanged in modern editions; and the same manner of spelling may be found also in proper names, especially when they are not familiar to English readers (*Hrolf's*, in Carlyle, *Heroes*, 29); similarly in *fly's* (carriages) as opposed to the more familiar *flies;* compare also the *Spectator*, No. 80, where Steele speaks of the manner in which people use "their *who's* and their *whiches*".[1] Conversely the apostrophe is not written before every *s* denoting the genitive: *whose, its, hers, yours* being the received spelling, while it is true that some people write *her's* and *your's*.

In dealing with the forms of the spoken language I shall, however, for convenience' sake give them in their usual spelling, though it would, of course, have been more consistent had I written all my examples phonetically. The abbreviations will be the same as in the Old English section, as far as they are needed; "a." means the modern accusative, dative, or common oblique case (*him*, etc.); "abs." stands for the absolute form of the possessive pronouns (*mine*, etc.).

## I. MORPHOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION.

### 28. (130) A. The kernel of the word unchanged.

(1) n a s. in all words; as exceptions might be mentioned those few pronouns which have separate forms for the accusative (*me, us, him, her, them*).

[1] Cf. also Alford, *The Queen's English*, p. 12.

(2) n a p. (*a*) *you.* (*b*) *sheep* and *deer.*[1] (*c*) the ordinary compounds of *-man, gentleman* and *gentlemen* being pronounced alike; so *postmen, policemen*, etc. (*d*) some words ending in *-s* [z]: *e.g., means, species.* (*e*) many words are unchanged in the plural in special connexions, especially after numerals and collectively: six *pair* of gloves; twenty-three *snipe; people, fowl, fish, cattle*, etc.

**29.** (131) B. **The ordinary s ending.**

(that is: the sounds -iz added to a sibilant [s, z, sh, zh];
the sound -s after a voiceless non-sibilant;
the sound -z after a voiced non-sibilant.)

(*a*) g s. in all nouns and some pronouns: *prince's, duke's, king's, whose, somebody's.*

(*b*) n a p. in the majority of nouns and some pronouns: *princes, dukes, kings, somebodies.*

(*c*) g p. in the same words as under (*b*), if the g p. can at all be used: *princes', dukes', kings'* (*somebodies'*).

(*d*) The same ending denotes the idea of genitive in all those plurals which are not formed by the addition of *-s*: *men's, gentlemen's, children's.*

(*e*) absolute: *ours, yours, hers, theirs.*

**30.** (132) C. **Other endings.**

**-s.**

n a p. in *dice;* comp. also *pence, halfpence.*

[1] Here the common plural in *-s* seems also to gain ground; at any rate, Dr. Murray once told me that he had often heard *deers; sheeps* is found once in Shakespeare, *Love's L. L.*, ii., 219 (pun with *ships*).

**-n.**

(*a*) n a p. in *oxen*.

(*b*) abs. in *mine*.

**31.** (133) D. **Change in the kernel.**

(1) without any ending.

n a p.: *men*, *women*, *geese*, *teeth*, *feet*, *mice*, *lice*. The plural forms *these* and *those* might be mentioned here or perhaps better under (3), as *-se* [z] is felt as a sort of plural ending.

(2) with the ending *-ren* (or *-n*).

n a p. *children* (*brethren*).

(3) with the *-s* ending.

n a (g) p. *wives* (and *wives'*) and others in *f*; *paths* and others in *th*, *houses*, the change in the kernel consisting here in the substitution of the voiced for the voiceless sound.[1]

As an ulterior case in point might be mentioned the frequent omission of the þ- sound in such plurals as *months*, *sixths*, *eleventhes*, etc. In words ending in *-nd* the plural is frequently pronounced without the *d*: *soun(d)s*, etc. We are perhaps allowed to consider Shakespeare's rhyming *downs* and *hounds* together (*Venus and Ad.*, 677) as an early instance of this pronunciation.

(4) an entirely new kernel

is finally used to distinguish cases in some pronouns: *I*, *me*, *we*, *us*, etc.

[1] In *staff—staves* we have the same consonantal change combined with a change of the vowel sound, but the modern language tends to make two regular words out of the one irregular: *staff—staffs*, and *stave—staves*.

**32.** (134) *Coalescence* of formerly distinct cases is found very extensively.

n a p. = n a s. in the words mentioned above, A 2.

g p. = g s. consequently in nearly all the same words.

The three cases: *gen. sg.*, *nom.* (and *acc.*) *pl.*, and *gen. pl.*, have become identical in nearly all words, so that you can very soon enumerate the very few words in which they differ from each other, namely:—

All the three cases are different: *child's*, *children*, *children's;* similarly with *man*, *woman*, and finally with a few words where the gen. pl. is, however, scarcely used at all: *tooth*, *goose*, *mouse*, *louse; dice*, *pence*, *oxen;* compounds on the model of *son-in-law* would belong here if genitive plurals, like *sons-in-law's*, were not universally avoided.

g s. different from n a p., which is identical with g p.: *wife's*, *wives*, *wives'* and the other word mentioned under D 3.

The two genitives are different from the two nominatives in the nouns mentioned under A 2.

**33.** (135) A comparison with Old English will show that all the vocalic and most of the nasal case-endings have been abandoned; the changes of the kernel have been considerably limited so that more particularly those which were not in themselves sufficient to distinguish cases have been given up; further we see that one difference, which was unknown to Old English, has been made subservient to case-distinguishing purposes (O. E. genitive *wulfes*, nomina-

tive plural *wulfas*, both of them pronounced with *v*; modern, *wolf's*, *wolves*), and finally the provinces of the unchanged kernel and of the *s* form have been very considerably extended.

## II. SYNTACTICAL CLASSIFICATION.

**34.** (136)

N a. s g.: —
p l.: -s, +, (-n, —).
G e n. s g.: -s, poss. pron.
p l.: -s, + s, (-ns); poss. pron.

Here, as in a few places above, I have silently omitted the exceptional forms of the personal pronouns.

**35.** (137) A comparison with Old English will here show that—apart from a few pronouns, which distinguish a nominative and an objective case—the old nominative, accusative, dative and instrumental cases have coalesced to form a common case, which shows moreover a few traces of the fact that the old genitive plural grew to be formally identical with the common case of the singular number (*e.g.*, a *twopenny* stamp, a five *pound* note).

---

**36.** (138) The question naturally arises, How has it come about that the Old English system of declensions has been so completely metamorphosed? Is it possible to point out any single cause as the effectual agent in bringing about this revolution?

An answer which has been given often enough, and which is offered by some scholars even now, was formulated by one of the foremost masters of the historical science of language as follows:—

"Any violent mixture of two languages is against nature, and results in a rapid destruction of the forms of both. When a great mass of *French* words rushed in upon the English language, few if any forms passed over to its grammar, but the Saxon forms suddenly collapsed, because they did not agree with the new roots, and because the genius of the language was led by the crude employment of the foreign material to neglect the native flexion. . . . This rapid sinking from the more perfect Anglo-Saxon forms . . . is easily explained by *influence from Danish and Norman-French*. According to a universal and natural law, where two different tongues come in collision, grammatical forms are lost. One of the most important consequences was the thorough introduction of *s* in all plurals, which agrees with French usage and is not entirely unknown to the Saxon grammar."[1]

**37.** (139) Such an influence from Norman-French, however, is contradicted by various considerations, partly of a general, partly of a special nature. It would, indeed, have been at least imaginable, supposing

[1] GRIMM, *Deutsche Grammatik*, i. (1819), pp. xxxii. and 177-178. So also Madvig, *Kleine philol. Schriften*, 27; Earle, *Philology of the Engl. Tongue*, 1st ed., p. 41; Elze, *Englische Philologie*, p. 245.

that the two constituent elements of the population, the French-speaking and the English-speaking, had been co-equal in numbers. But this was not the case. Moreover, it is admitted that the vast majority of the conquered people spoke English and never learned to speak French; they were not, therefore, exposed to having their sense of the grammatical structure of their native dialects impaired by commixture with foreign modes of speech. And, where influence from the foreign idiom could not be avoided, it must have taken place essentially in the same manner as French and English influence each other at the present day, by the adoption, that is, of single words, which are then incorporated, substantially, into the native system of grammar.[1] Just as a modern Frenchman inflects the loan-words *leader*, *sport*, in accordance with the laws of his own language, and turns the English verb *stop* into *stopper* (*stoppant*, etc.),—just as, when some composite expression passes into his language, he does not shrink from forming such a derivative as *strugg(le)-for-lifeur* (Daudet),—precisely in the same manner did the English peasant act when he caught up a word from the courtly speech of the Normans. Quite instinctively he affixed to it his own terminations without troubling himself for a moment whether they would or would not "agree with the new roots".

**38.** (140) But, whilst the Norman Conquest exerted no *direct* influence on English grammatical

[1] Cf. Murray, *The Engl. Language*, in the *Encycl. Brit.*, viii., 393.

structure, there can be no doubt that it went far to accelerate the development of change *indirectly*. This was principally due to the fact that England was for some centuries without that retarding and conservative influence which will always make itself felt wherever cultivated classes speaking a "refined" speech exist side by side with a proletariat whose linguistic peculiarities are branded as vulgarisms, or as downright solecisms. Any such control as comes from an upper class whose more old-fashioned language is looked upon as a model, and, partly at least, imitated by the lower classes, was precluded at the period we are speaking of, inasmuch as the upper classes did not speak English, or, at best, spoke only bad English. In consequence of this, not only was the literary tradition of the English language lost or reduced to a minimum, but even in its oral transmission, which is always the more important matter, and was especially so then, one element was wanting which generally assists in stemming the tide of revolutionary tendencies.

**39.** (141) If now we look at the only detail in English accidence for which a Norman descent is claimed (namely, the plural *-s* [1]), some remarks will

[1] Even Sayce says, *Introd. to Sc. of L.*, i., 172: "The great extension of the English plural in *-s*, confined as it was in Anglo-Saxon to a comparatively few words, seems due to Norman-French influence". The same view is taken by Strong, *Academy*, Oct. 20, 1893; cf. also the correspondence in the following numbers of that paper between Napier, Earle and myself.

have to be made which perhaps have not been all propounded before.

(1) The growth of the plural *-s* cannot be separated from that of *-s* in the genitive case. Now the latter gained ground even more rapidly and extensively than the plural *-s*, and French influence is here utterly unimaginable. Why, then, resort to it with regard to the other ending?

(2) The plural in *-s* was long before the Conquest extended to many nouns which had formerly had other endings, belonging to the *i-* and *u-* classes, as also to some of the consonant stems (*wyrmas*, *winas*, *sunas*, *hæleðas*, etc., see § 17). This shows that the tendency of the language would have been the same even if William the Conqueror had never crossed the Channel.

(3) *-S* became universal in the North at an earlier date than in the South, where we should expect to find French influence strongest, but where *-en* seems for a long time to have had better chances of prevailing in all nouns than *-s*.

(4) In Old French *-s* was not used to the same extent as now as a plural ending; indeed, it can hardly be called a plural sign proper, as it was in the most numerous and important class of nouns the sign of the nom. sg. and of the acc. pl., but not of the nom. pl. If, therefore, an Englishman of (say) the thirteenth century used the *-s* in the nom. pl., he was in accord with the rules of his native tongue, but not with those of French.

(5) If *-s* was due to the Normans, we should expect it in the plural of the adjectives as well as of nouns; but, as a matter of fact, adjectives take it extremely rarely,[1] and hardly except in those cases where a Romance adjective is placed after its noun. Everywhere else, Middle and Modern English adjectives have no *-s* in plural, agreeing therein with the old native tradition, but not with French grammar.

(6) And, finally, it is worth noting that the two endings, Norman *-s* without any vowel, and English *-es* (originally *-as*) with the vowel pronounced, were kept distinct for about four hundred years in English; they are not confounded till, in the fifteenth century, the weak *e* disappears in pronunciation.

**40.** (142) Thus, at the one definite point where the theory of French influence has been advanced with regard to accidence, it is utterly unable to stand the test of historical investigation. And it is the same case, I believe, with many of the assertions put forward of late years by E. EINENKEL with regard to a French influence exerted wholesale on English *syntax*.[2] Einenkel's method is simplicity itself. In

[1] According to Ten Brink only twice in the whole of the poetic parts of the *Canterbury Tales* (*Chaucers Sprache u. Verskunst*, § 243), to which add *Hous of Fame*, 460, the "goddes celestials". Where Chaucer gives a direct prose translation from French, this *-s* occurs more frequently, thus in the *Tale of Melibeus*, which Ten Brink does not mention.

[2] See his *Streifzüge durch die me. Syntax*, 1887, his articles in the *Anglia*, xiii., and in Paul's *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, i., 907 and foll. Einenkel's syntactical investigations

dealing with any syntactical phenomenon of Middle English, he searches through Tobler's *Verm. Beiträge zur Frz. Grammatik* and the ever-increasing literature of German dissertations on Old French syntax, in quest of some other phenomenon of a similar kind. As soon as this is discovered, it is straightway made the prototype of its Middle English analogue, sometimes in spite of the French parallel being perhaps so rare a use that even Tobler himself can only point out a very few instances of it, whilst its English counterpart is of everyday occurrence. In several cases French influence is assumed, although Einenkel himself mentions that the phenomenon in question existed even in Old English, or, not unfrequently, though it must be considered so simple and natural a development as to be quite likely to spring up spontaneously in a variety of different languages. A little knowledge of Scandinavian languages would, for example, with regard to many points have convinced Einenkel that these present the very same phenomena which when occurring in English he explains from Old French.

**41.** (143) A far greater influence than that exercised upon English by the Gallicised Normans must be ascribed to the *Danish* Wikings, who for such a long space of time were acting a prominent part in Britain, and whose significance for the life of the

will, of course, in some measure keep their value, even though his theories on the origin of the phenomena he discusses are exaggerated and erroneous.

English people cannot easily be over-estimated. As for the language, it should be borne in mind that the tongue spoken by the Danes was so nearly akin with the native dialects that the two peoples could understand one another without much difficulty. But it was just such circumstances which made it natural that many *nuances* of grammar should be sacrificed, the intelligibility of either tongue coming to depend mainly on its mere vocabulary. It is in harmony with this view that the wearing away and levelling of grammatical forms in the regions in which the Danes chiefly settled was a couple of centuries in advance of the same process in the more southern parts of the country.

A fully satisfactory solution of the question of the mutual relations of North English and Scandinavian at that time must be regarded as hopeless on account of the small number, and generally inadequate character, of linguistic records; and, unless some fresh sources become accessible to us, we shall probably never learn clearly and unequivocally which points of correspondence in the two languages are attributable to primitive affinities, which others to loans from one language to the other, or, finally, how much may be due to independent parallel development in two areas which offered such striking analogies in so many essential particulars. But, as I hold, any linguistic change should primarily be explained on the basis of the language itself, while analogues from other languages may serve as illustra-

tions and help to show what in the development of a language is due to psychological causes of a universal character, and what is, on the other hand, to be considered the effect of the idiosyncrasies of the particular idiom.

**42.** (144) I return to the question of the cause of the simplification of the English system of declensions, and I will quote another answer, which agrees better than Grimm's with the linguistic theories prevailing now-a-days. This explanation is formulated by one of the most competent English scholars of our time, Dr. J. A. H. MURRAY, as follows :— [1]

"The total loss of grammatical *gender* in English, and the almost complete disappearance of *cases*, are *purely phonetic phenomena*".

In other words: a phonetic law which operates "blindly," *i.e.*, without regard to the signification, causes the Old English unstressed vowels *-a*, *-e*, *-u*, to become merged in an obscure *-e* in Middle English; as these endings were very often distinctive of cases, the Old English cases were consequently lost. Another phonetic law was operating in a similar manner by causing the loss of the final *-n*, which was equally utilised, though in a different way, in the Old English declension. Upon this I have to remark, first, that beside the phonetic laws must at all events be mentioned analogy. It is this which, for example, has led to the levelling of the nominative plural and dative plural: if phonetic decay had been

[1] *Encycl. Brit.*, viii., 400.

the only factor, Old English *stanas* and *stanum* would still have been distinguished from one another, namely as *stones* and *stone;* whereas, in fact, the former form has been extended to the dative. This, however, must by no means be interpreted as an objection to Dr. Murray and the scholars who hold his view, and who are as fully alive to this principle of explanation as anybody else.

**43.** (145) I have stated elsewhere my reasons for disbelieving in the axiom of the so-called young grammarian school of the blind working of sound laws, and in the theory of sound laws and analogy sufficing between them to explain everything in linguistic development.[1] Here I shall add, with regard to the special question concerning us in this chapter, that the young grammarians' view does not look deep enough in its search for explanations. If simplification of forms is to be attributed in the main to the phonetic law of unstressed terminations, what, then, is the *cause of the phonetic law?* And if, on the other hand, analogy has played an important part in this development, the question arises, if it is not possible to suggest causes why the principle of analogy should have thus asserted itself.

Let us for a moment suppose that each of the terminations *-a*, *-e*, *-u*, bore in Old English its own distinctive and sharply defined meaning, which was necessary to the right understanding of the sentences in which the terminations occurred. Would there in

[1] See *Phonetische Grundfragen*, Leipzig, 1904, chap. vii.

that case be any probability that a phonetic law tending to their levelling could ever succeed in establishing itself? Most certainly not; the all-important regard for intelligibility would have been sure to counteract any inclination towards a slurred pronunciation of the terminations. Nor would there have been any occasion for new formations by analogy, as the endings were already sufficiently alike.

**44.** (146) The above comparative survey of the declensions of Old and Modern English furnishes an answer to the questions proposed, and makes the whole causality appear in a much clearer light than would be possible by any other arrangement of the grammatical facts: *the cause of the decay of the Old English apparatus of declensions lay in its manifold incongruities.* The same termination did not always denote the same thing; the same case was signified now by this, now by that means; many relations plainly distinguished from each other in one class of words were but imperfectly, if at all, distinguishable in another class. And yet there is a still further cause of mixture and confusion which our arrangement does not bring out—the one, namely, which is latent in terms like dative, accusative, etc. In fact, these terms have no clear and definite meaning in the case of Old English, any more than in the case of kindred tongues; in many cases it did not even matter which of two or more cases the speaker chose to employ. Thus, not a few verbs existed which were employed

now with one, now with another case; and it was often impossible to perceive any accompanying difference of meaning.[1] And so also with other parts of speech: the preposition *on*, as applied to time, sometimes governed the dative (instrumental), sometimes the accusative: thus we find in close succession (*Chron.*, 979, C.), *on þys geare . . . on þone sunnandœig;* (*ibid.*, 992, E.) *on þere nihte* ðe hi *on* ðone *dœi* togædere cumon sceoldon;[2] similarly (*Oros.*, 136, 23 and foll.) on westeweardum *þisses middangeardes*, . . . on easteweardum *þeosan middangearde* (comp. same page, l. 7), and so on.

**45.** (147) This condition of things naturally gave rise to a good deal of uncertainty, which manifested itself partly in a rather inaccurate pronunciation of the endings, partly in the use of them in places where they did not belong.

This now and then happened in such a manner as to bring about coincidences of sound without assisting clearness, nay, even at its expense, as, for instance, is the case when we find in the *Cura Past.*, 166, 2 and 20: to *anra* ðara ðreora burga, instead of *anre* (see Sweet's note in his *A. S. Reader*, p. 191). Generally, however, such uses of endings on analogy

[1] See particularly the materials collected by M. Sohrauer, *Kleine Beitr. zur ae. Gramm.*, pp. 10-26.

[2] *On* with the dative case here corresponded to an older *in*, while with the accusative it was the old *an* (comp. Germ. *in*, *an*), but I doubt very much if the old West Saxon author was alive to any difference in his use of *on* in the two phrases.

are apt to crop up in such places particularly where the traditional terminations are not sufficiently distinct, or where cases have been levelled which it is important should be kept apart. For example, *giefa* stands alike for the nominative plural and the genitive plural, and misapprehensions are the consequence. These are obviated by the extension to the nominative and genitive respectively of the termination *-e* from the *i*-class and *-ena* from the *n*-class (nominative *giefe*, genitive *giefena*).

But if the transmutations, phonetic as well as non-phonetic, of the old declensions took their rise from the numerous inconsistencies of the system and its want of fixed boundaries, formal or functional, then what is described above as the true grammatical arrangement exhibits the prospects of the various cases and endings in their struggle for existence. By its aid we are, in some measure, in a position to cast the horoscope of the whole system and predict the main features of its destinies.

**46.** (148) The vocalic terminations (B) were evidently the least distinct and least sharply defined; each of these had many values, nor were they uniformly distributed in the different classes of inflexion. Here accordingly every succeeding generation when it came to learning the language was offered only scanty points of support and a great many chances of going wrong. It is therefore not surprising that these endings were confounded and effaced and in a later period entirely dropped, as

there was no well-defined barrier between the use of the bare kernel of the word, and the kernel *plus* the vocalic termination *-e*, in which the endings *-e*, *-a*, *-u*, had at that time been merged.

The nasal endings were possessed of greater power of resistance. But they, too, were doomed, chiefly owing to the exceedingly common use of the ending *-an* in the weak forms of adjectives, where it was of no consequence whatever for the signification, and could therefore be neglected without any loss. In the case of verbal forms, too, where endings in *-n* occurred also, they did not perform any function of sufficient importance to check the tendency to drop the sound in pronunciation; in fact, at an early period we meet with collocations like *binde we*, *binde ge*, *mote we*, etc., in which the *-n* had fallen away (Siev., § 360).

**47.** (149) Where, on the other hand, the *-n* was protected by a following vowel, it could withstand the levelling tendencies better. This would be especially the case in the genitive plural, because of the distinctive meaning of this genitive. The same thing is also particularly true of the two *-s* endings, each of which was confined to a sharply limited sphere of use. The *-s* is too important to be left out; if, on the other hand, the two endings *-as* and *-es* are levelled in the Middle English *-es*, this is mainly due to the influence exercised by the other endings. As *-a* and *-e* were not distinctive enough in point of meaning to oppose a strong resistance to the tendency prevailing in all

languages to obscure vowels in weak syllables, nay, even invited this tendency, *-as* and *-es* had to submit to the resulting "phonetic law". This they did without any very great detriment to intelligibility, the connexion in which they occur being nearly everywhere sufficient to show whether the genitive singular or nominative plural was meant, especially after the rule had been established by which the genitive is always placed before its governing word (see chapter iii.).

As regards the prospects which changes of kernel have of maintaining themselves, we can only be certain of this much, that those which have become attended with inherent change of signification are, by a natural consequence, more likely to be permanent than the others, which are more liable to be affected by levelling tendencies, inasmuch as a new regular form which agrees with the shape of the word in other cases is sure to be understood as well as, or even better than, the traditional one. But, on the other hand, forces tending to change pronunciation are continually at work, and these give rise to fresh changes of kernel; we may mention, for instance, the laws of quantity which have split up the Old English *sceadu* into the two Modern English words *shade* and *shadow*. To foretell the durability of such modifications is, of course, a matter of impossibility.

**48.** (150) To sum up, setting aside changes of kernel, the other modifications of the nouns in Old English declensions are of a character to enable us

to form an opinion on the main features of their destinies by considering the reciprocal relations of phonetic expression and inward signification, the more so as it was just the least ambiguous endings (*-as*, *-es*) that were used to denote the syntactical relations which are the most distinctive and appear to be the most indispensable in language, *viz.*, plurality and connexion (genitive). Logically to define the other case-relations is a matter of much more difficulty : the dative and accusative cases often come in contact with each other, and both have also some points of agreement with the nominative. Hence arises the chance of endless confusions, even where the forms are sharply distinguished (see the next chapter). In fact, there is every occasion, be it said incidentally, alike from a formal and syntactical point of view, to prefer the arrangement of the cases prevalent in Denmark since Rask — nominative accusative, dative, genitive—to any other, and more especially to that still current in Germany where the genitive is placed between the nominative and the accusative.

## CHAPTER II.

### CASE-SHIFTINGS IN THE PRONOUNS.

**49.** (151) In the Oldest English pronouns we find the nominative, accusative, and dative cases distinct both in point of accidence and syntax, although in a few pronouns there is no formal difference between the nominative and accusative (in the plurals of the third person (*hie*); in the neuter (*hit*, *hwæt*, etc.), in the feminine form *heo* or *hie*).

The first step in the simplification of this system is the abandonment of the separate forms *mec*, *þec*, *usic*, *eowic*, *uncit*, *incit*, which are used only in the very oldest texts as accusatives distinct from the datives *me*, *þe*, *us*, *eow*, *unc*, *inc*, and which are soon ousted by the latter forms. By parallel developments occurring somewhat later, the old dative forms *hire* (*hir*, *her*), *him* and *hwam* (*whom*) are made to fill the offices held hitherto by the old accusatives *heo*, *hine* and *hwone*. In some of the southern counties *hine* is, however, preserved up till our times in the form of [an], see Ellis, *Early Engl. Pronunciation*, v., p. 43; in the literary transcription of these dialects this is written *'un*, *e.g.*, in Fielding's *Tom Jones* (Squire

Western, etc.), and in Thackeray's *Pendennis* (i., 62, "Show Mr. Pendennis up to *'un*").[1] In the plural, also, the dative form has expelled the old acc.; *hem* (O. E. *him*, *heom;* preserved in familiar and vulgar speech: "I know 'em") and the later *them* are originally datives;[2] the neuter singular, on the other hand, has preserved the old accusative forms *hit* (*it*), *þæt* (*that*), *hwæt* (*what*), at the expense of the old datives.

The reason of this constant preferring of the dative forms in the person-indicating pronouns is no doubt the fact that these pronouns are used as indirect objects more often than either nouns or adjectives;[3] at any rate, it is a phenomenon very frequently found in various languages; compare Danish *ham*, *hende*, *dem*, *hvem*, originally datives, now also accusatives and partly even nominatives (while it is true that in *mig* and *dig* the acc. has outlived the dative); North

[1] *Pendennis*, p. 50, Thackeray uses *'n* as a plural ("Hand down these 'ere trunks." "Hand'n down yourself"); but this is hardly due to a direct and correct observation of the real spoken language.

[2] *Chron.*, 893, the Parker MS. has "hie asettan *him* . . . ofer," but the Laud MS.: "hi ásætton *hi* . . . ofer"; it is perhaps allowable here to suppose a blending of the transitive "asetton hie" and the intransitive "asæton him"; cf. § 188. But in *Chron.*, 828, we have an indubitable outcome of the tendency to replace the old acc. by the dat., for the Parker MS. reads: "he *hie* to eaþmodre hersumnesse gedyde," but the Laud MS.: "he *heom* ealle [N.B. not eallum!] to eadmodere hyrsumnesse gedyde".

[3] A. Kock, in *Nord. Tidskrift for Philologi*, n. r. iii., 256.

German *wem* for *wen*,[1] French *lui* as an absolute pronoun (while the acc. has carried the day in *elle*, *eux*, *elles*; *moi* and *toi* may be either); Italian *lui*, *lei*, *loro*,[2] etc.

**50.** (152) In this chapter I propose to deal at some length with those tendencies to further modifications of the pronominal case-system which may be observed after the accusatives and datives have everywhere become identical. The forms concerning us are in their present spelling:—

| nom. | acc.—dat. |
|---|---|
| *I, we* | *me, us* |
| *thou, ye* | *thee, you* |
| *he, she, they* | *him, her, them* |
| *who* | *whom.* |

Simplification has gone further in the case of the pronouns of the second person than in that of the others; in fact, if we were to believe the ordinary grammars, the substitution of *you* for *ye* is the only point in which a deviation from the old system has taken place. But ordinary grammars are not always trustworthy; in laying down their rules they are too

[1] Franke, in *Phonetische Studien*, ii., 50.

[2] Storm, *Engl. Philologie*, 208; compare also the interesting remarks in Franceschi, *In Città e in Campagna*, 585: "*lui*, *lei*, *loro*, per egli, ella, eglino ed elleno, che nel parlar famigliare parrebbe affettazione. . . . Questi e altri idiotismi e certe sgrammaticature . . . io fo di quando in quando scappar fuori dai mei personaggi, perchè vivono nella bocca del popolo toscano, come sa chi vi nacque o vi stette lungamente in mezzo, e portò amore alla sua parlata."

apt to forget that the English language is one thing, common-sense or logic another thing, and Latin grammar a third, and that these three things have really in many cases very little to do with one another. Schoolmasters generally have an astonishing talent for not observing real linguistic facts, and an equally astonishing inclination to stamp everything as faulty that does not agree with their narrow rules; and the precepts inculcated in the school-room have no doubt had some influence in checking natural tendencies, though the following pages will suffice to show that the best authors have in many points deviated more from the rules laid down in grammars than is generally supposed.

**51.** (153) Many of the phenomena I shall treat of have, as a matter of course, been noticed and partly explained by modern grammarians of the historical school; I shall specially mention KOCH, *Hist. Gramm.*, ii. (especially p. 244[1]); MÄTZNER, *Engl. Gramm.*, ii. *passim*; ABBOTT, *A Shakespearian Grammar*, § 205 ff.; A. SCHMIDT, *Shakespeare-Lexikon*; STORM, *Englische Philologie*, 1881, p. 207 ff.; GUMMERE, *The English Dative-Nom. of the Person. Pron.*, in *American Journ. of Philol.*, iv.; W. FRANZ, *Die*

[1] In the second edition of Koch's work, Prof. Zupitza has already remarked that the earliest of Koch's examples must be explained differently or are untrustworthy; but even Koch's "altenglische" examples prove nothing; thus *þam* in "þer restid þam doun" must certainly be the common reflexive dative (see below, § 86), and not the subject of the sentence.

*dialektspr. bei Dickens*, *Engl. St.*, xii., 223 f., and *Zur syntax des älteren Neuenglisch*, *ibid.*, xvii., 212 ff.; KELLNER, in the Introduction to *Caxton's Blanchardyn* (EETS. Extra Series 58).

On the whole these authors content themselves with a purely lexical treatment of the matter, giving for instance all the examples of *I* for *me* and *vice versâ* under one head, and only occasionally offering an explanation of some phenomena; the fullest and most satisfactory explanations are found in Storm's excellent work. In the following sections I shall attempt a systematic arrangement according to the psychological or phonetic principles underlying the phenomena and causing speakers or writers to use another case than that exacted by the rules of ordinary grammar. I shall first take those classes of case-shiftings which are of a more general character and may occur more or less frequently in all languages of our type, giving last those which belong more specially to English or to one particular period of English.

It must be specially mentioned that in many of the sentences quoted two or even more causes of shifting have operated concurrently.

### I. Relative Attraction.

**52.** (154) A pronoun in the principal proposition is often put in the case which the corresponding relative pronoun has or ought to have. This is particularly easy to explain where no relative pronoun is used; the so-called relative ellipsis originates

in a construction *apo koinou*, the personal pronoun belonging equally well to both propositions. Examples abound, both where the relative pronoun is expressed and where it is understood.

Chaucer, *M. P.*, 5, 623, "*Him* that she cheest, *he* shal her have as swythe" | Caxton (see Kellner, xiv.), "*him* that he rought with full stroke was all in to brused" | Shak., *Cor.*, v., 6, 5, "*Him* I accuse (:) the city port by this hath enter'd" | *Ant.*, iii., 1, 15, "*him* we serues [serve's] away" | *Rom.*, 1032 (ii., 3, 85), "*her* I loue now Doth grace for grace, and loue for loue allow" (the oldest quarto *she whom*) | *Haml.*, ii., 1, 42, "*him* you would sound . . . be assured *he* closes . . ." | *Temp.*, v., 1, 15; *As*, i., 1, 46; 1 *H. VI.*, iv., 7, 75 | Tennyson, 370, "*Our noble Arthur, him* Ye scarce can over-praise, will hear and know" | Troll., *Duke's Ch.*, i., 161 (a lady writes), "I have come to be known as *her* whom your uncle trusted and loved, as *her* whom your wife trusted . . ."

Very often after *it is* :—

Marlowe, *Jew*, 1034, "'Tis not thy wealth, but *her* that I esteeme" (= I esteeme her) | Sh., 2 *H. VI.*, iv., 1, 117, "it is *thee* I feare" | *Sonn.* 62, "'Tis *thee* (my self) that for my self I praise" | Thack., *Pend.*, i., 269, "it's not *me* I'm anxious about" | *ibid.*, iii., 301, "it is not *him* I want" | Troll., *Old Man*, 121, "It is her you should consult on such a matter".

Nom. for acc. is rarer in case of relative attraction.[1]

Sh., *V. A.*, 109, "thus *he* that overrul'd I overswayed" | *Troil.*, ii., 3, 252, "praise him that got thee, *she* that gaue thee sucke"; comp. *Hml.*, i., 2, 105; 2 *H. VI.*, iii., 2, 89; *R. III.*, iv., 4, 101 f. | Bunyan (see Storm, 211), "the encouraging words of *he* that led in the front".

## II. Blendings.

**53.** (155) Contaminations or blendings of two constructions between which the speaker is wavering occur in all languages. The first class of contaminations concerning us here is caused by vacillation between *an accusative with infinitive and a finite verb*, exemplified in the Bible phrase: O. E., "*Hwæne* secgad men þæt sy mannes sunu?" Auth. V., "*Whom* do men say that I the son of man am?" (Matt., xvi., 13), as compared with the more "grammatically correct" construction in Wyclif: "*Whom* seien men to be mannus sone?" In the parallel passage, Luke, ix., 18 and 20, Wyclif writes: "*Whom* seien the puple that Y am? . . . But *who* seien ȝe that Y am?" From secular authors I shall quote:—

Chauc., *Morr.*, iii., 26, 803, "as ye han herd *me* sayd" [rhyme: apayd; for *me saye* or *I said*] | *B.*, 665, "yet wole we vs auyse *whom*

[1] Relative attraction is the reason of the three abnormal *he*'s in Caxton which Kellner quotes on p. xv., but does not explain.

that we wole that [v. r. om. that] shal ben our Justyse" | Sh., *Cor.*, iv., 2, 2, "the nobility . . . *whom* we see haue sided in his behalfe" | *Temp.*, iii., 3, 92, "Ferdinand (*whom* they suppose is droun'd)" | *Meas.*, ii., 1, 72, "[my wife] *whom* I thanke heauen is an honest woman" | *Tim.*, iv., 3, 120, "a bastard, *whom* the oracle Hath doubtfully pronounced thy [fol. the] throat shall cut" | Fielding, *T. J.*, iv., 130, "I would have both *you* and *she* know that it is not for her fortune he follows her" | Darwin, *Life and L.*, i., 60, "to assist those *whom* he thought deserved assistance" | Muloch, *Halifax*, ii., 11, "one *whom* all the world knew was so wronged and so unhappy".[1]

Note also Sh., *Cor.*, i., 1, 236, "And were I anything but what I am, I would wish me only *he*," where *he* is the only natural form, as *him* would only obscure the meaning of the phrase.[2] In R. Haggard, *Cleopatra*, ii.,

[1] The phenomenon is nearly akin to the well-known insertion of what should be the subject of the subordinate clause as the object of the principal proposition; see, for instance, Chaucer, *B.*, 4392, "Herkneth *thise blisful briddes* how they singe, And see *the fressche floures* how they springe" | Sh., *Wint. T.*, i., 2, 181, "you perceive *me* not how I give lyne". A good many examples have been collected by Kellner, *Blanch.*, xvi. ("And God saw the light that it was good"); cf. also Wright's note, Sh., *Tw. N.*, p. 100.

[2] Compare also Stevenson, *Treas. Isl.*, 171, "Some one was close behind, I knew not *whom*".

121, "rather than I would see her thy wedded wife and *thou* her loving lord," we have an approach to the phenomenon mentioned below, § 164.

When we find in the middle of the sixteenth century such sentences as these :—

*Roister D.*, 38, "And let me see *you* play me such a part againe" | *ibid.*, 76, "I woulde see *you* aske pardon,"

we may be pretty sure that the author meant *you* as the acc. case and the verbs *play* and *aske* as infinitives; but to a later generation neither the form of the pronoun nor that of the verb would exclude the possibility of *you* being the nominative before finite verbs ( = let me see (that) you . . . ).

**54.** (156) In these cases the blending was due to the fact that what was grammatically the object of one verb was logically the subject of another verb. This is particularly frequent in the combination *let us* (go, etc.), supplanting the older construction *go we*, etc.[1] The logical subject is here often put in the nominative, especially if separated from the word *let* :—

Genesis, xxi. 44, "Let *us* make a covenant, *I and thou*"[2] | Udall, *Roister*, 21, "Let all these matters passe, and *we* three sing a song"

[1] Still found in Sh., *e.g.*, *Macb.*, ii., 2, 65, "Retyre we" | v., 2, 25, "March we on".

[2] Compare the O. E. translation, "þæt freondscipe sig betwux unc, *me* and *þe*," which is a regular appositional construction ; cf. § 61.

| Sh., *Merch.*, iii., 2, 21, "let fortune goe to hell for it, not *I*" | *Cæs.*, iii., 1, 95, "let no man abide this deede, but *we* the doers" | Byron, iv., 240, "Let *He* who made thee answer that" | Hughes, *Tom Brown's Sch.*, 3, "let *you and I* cry quits".

Storm (*E. Philol.*, 211) has some modern quotations (from Dickens, who writes also: "*Leave* Nell and *I* to toil and work"), and quotes the Norwegian [and Danish] colloquial *lad vi det* for *lad os det.* In the corresponding Dutch construction both the nom. and acc. are allowed: "laat *mij* nu toonen" as well as "laat *ik* nu toonen" (let me now show); similarly "laat *hem* [*hij*] nu toonen, laat *ons* [laten *wij*] nu toonen, lat *hem* [laten *ze*] nu toonen".[1] In a passage from Guy of Warwick, 3531, "*Let hym* fynde a sarasyn And *y* to fynde a knyght of myn," we have a transition case between this phenomenon and that dealt with in § 62.

A similar confusion after the verb *make* is found in Sh., *Temp.*, iv., 1, 217, "mischeefe which may make this island Thine owne for ever, and *I* thy Caliban for aye thy foote-licker"; here Caliban forgets the first part of his sentences and goes on as if the beginning had been "this island shall become". So also in *Rich. II.*, iv., 1, 216, "[God] *make me*, that nothing

[1] See *Taalstudie*, 1887, 376. Mr. C. Stoffel informs me that the two constructions are not exact equivalents, a difference being made, for instance, between *laat hij gaan*, "qu'il aille," and *laat hem gaan*, "allow him to go".

haue, with nothing grieu'd, And *thou* with all pleas'd, that hast all atchieu'd".

In these cases the nominative is used in spite of grammatical rules requiring the acc., because the word is thought of as the subject; this is even, though rarely, the case after a preposition; in *Roister Doister*, p. 72, I find: "Nay *as for they*, shall euery mother's childe die;" and a phrase in a letter that is read aloud twice in the same play runs the first time "*as for all them* that woulde do you wrong" (p. 51), but the second time "as for all they" (p. 57). In § 68 ff. we shall see some more instances of the nominative, as the case proper to the subject, getting the better of the acc., required by earlier grammatical rules.

**55.** (157) Other contaminations leading to confusions of two cases are found here and there. In Sh., *Temp.*, ii., 1, 28, we read: "Which, of *he*, or Adrian . . . First begins to crow?" This is a blending of "Which, he or A.," and "Which of [the two] him and A.," or else *of* may be a printer's error for *or*, as conjectured by Collier. In Sir Andrew's interruption, *Tw. N.*, ii., 5, 87, "[you waste the treasure of your time with a foolish knight.—] That's *mee* I warrant you," *me* is due to the use of the accus. in the preceding sentence (=with me); immediately afterwards he says: "I knew 'twas *I*;" in Malvolio's speech, "If this should be *thee*," *thee* is similarly the

[1] Compare *Hamlet*, i., 4, 54, and H. Fritsche's note in his edition of that play, Berlin, 1880.

object of the preceding *I loue.* Comp. Thack., *Pend.*, iii., 87, "If ever I *saw* a man in love, that man is *him*". The opposite result of the contamination is found in Sh., *Troil.*, ii., 3, 102, "Achillis hath inveigled his foole from him.—*Who*, Thersites?—*He*" (= who is it? it is he); parallel cases occur at every moment in colloquial language.

**56.** (158) A good deal of confusion arises from *some words being both prepositions and conjunctions.* With regard to *but*, Dr. Murray says in *N. E. D.*:—

"In some of these uses, the conjunction is, even in Modern English, not distinctly separated from the preposition: the want of inflexions in substantives, and the colloquial use of *me*, *us*, for *I*, *we*, etc., as complemental nominatives in the pronouns, making it uncertain whether *but* is to be taken as governing a case. In other words 'nobody else went but me (or I)' is variously analysed as = 'nobody else went except me' and 'nobody else went except (that) I (went),' and as these mean precisely the same thing, both are pronounced grammatically correct." (Comp. also Murray's examples, especially under the heads C. 3 and 4.) It should, however, be remarked that the confusion in the use of *but* is not a consequence of the want of distinct case-endings in the nouns and the use of *me* instead of *I* in other connexions; in my view it is on the contrary the existence of such two-sided words as *but*, etc., that is one of the primary causes of mistakes of *me* for *I* or *vice versâ* and careless uses of the cases generally. Even in such a

language as German, where the cases are generally kept neatly apart, we find such combinations as "niemand kommt mir entgegen *ausser ein unverschämter*" (Lessing); "wo ist ein gott *ohne der herr*" (Luther); "kein gott ist ohne *ich*," etc.[1]

Sometimes both the preposition and the conjunction would require the same case as in these quotations from Murray's Dict.: "Se is æthwam freond butan dracan anum | bot þe haf i na frend". In the following examples there is a conflict between the two constructions; and in some of them (which I have starred) the nominative is used, although both the preposition and conjunction would require the accusative, or *vice versâ*.

*Ancr. R.*, 408, "no þing ne con luuien ariht bute *he* one" | Chauc., *C.*, 282, "no man woot of it but god and *he*" (rhymes with *be*) | *Min. P.*, 2, 30, "no wight woot [it] but *I*" | Malory, 42, "neuer man shall haue that office but *he*" | Marlowe, *Jew*, 1576, "I neuer heard of any man but *he Malign'd the order of the Iacobines"[2] | Sh., *Cymb.*, i., 1, 24, "I do not thinke, so faire an outward, and such stuffe within endowes a man, but **hee*" | *ibid.*, ii., 3, 153, "That I kisse aught but **he*" | *As*, i., 2, 18, "my father had no childe, but **I*" | *Macb.*, iii., 1, 54, (854),

[1] See Paul, *Principien der Sprachgesch.*, 1st ed. 225, 2nd ed. 318; in Danish similar examples abound ("ingen *uden jeg*," etc.).

[2] Relative attraction concurring.

"There is none but *he* whose being I doe feare" | *Romeo*, 250, (i., 2, 14), "Earth hath swallowed all my hopes but **she*" | *R. III.*, ii., 2, 76, "What stayes had I but **they?*" | 2 *H. VI.*, i., 2, 69, "here's none but *thee* and *I*" | *Temp.*, iii., 2, 109, "I neuer saw a woman But onely Sycorax my dam, and **she*" | Thackeray, *Van. F.*, 521, "how pretty she looked. So do you! Everybody but *me* who am wretched" | R. L. Stevenson, *Child's Garden*, 17, "So there was no one left but *me*".[1]

**57.** (159) *Save* (*sauf*) presents similar phenomena of confusion, although it is comparatively seldom found as a preposition, as in Matth. Arnold, *Poems*, i., 159, "For of the race of Gods is no one there, save *me* alone"; and in Tennyson, p. 319, "Who should be king save *him* who makes us free?"[2] In Chaucer *sauf* (*save*) is very common with nom. (*B.*, 474, 627; *G.*, 1355; *I.*, 25; *L. G. W.*, 1633; *Morris*, ii., 221, 493; 342, 801), so also in Shakespeare (*Tw. N.*, iii., 1, 172; *Cæs.*, iii., 2, 66, etc.), and in modern poets (*e.g.*, Byron, iv., 332, "Who shall weep above your universal grave, save *I?*"). Where the word is not meant as the subject, the accusative is used (*e.g.*, Chaucer, *B.*, 4491,

[1] *Instead of* is sometimes used in such a way as to approach a conjunction; see Mrs. Grand, *The Heavenly Twins*, p. 42, "Now they rule him instead of *him them*".

[2] Mätzner (ii., 501) has two examples of *save* with acc., from Rogers and Skelton.

"Save *yow* I herde neuere man so singe;" where, however, one MS. (H) has *ye*). An example of an abnormal use of the nom. is Shak., *Sonn.* 109, 14, "For nothing in this wide universe I call, save *thou*, my rose".

For *except*, compare the following examples :—

Meredith, *Trag. Com.*, 28, "And everybody is to know him except *I?*" | Muloch, *Halifax*, ii., 22, "No one ever knew of this night's episode, except *us* three" | Mrs. Browning (a letter in Mrs. Orr, *Life and Letters of Rob. Br.*, 232), "Nobody exactly understands him except *me* who am in the inside of him and hear him breathe" | Hardy, *Tess*, 101, "Perhaps any woman would, except *me*".

**58.** (160) The conjunctions *as* and *than*, used in comparisons, give rise to similar phenomena. As it is possible to say both "I never saw anybody stronger *than he*" [scil. *is*], and "*than him*" (acc. agreeing with *anybody*), and "I never saw anybody so strong *as he*," and "*as him*," the feeling for the correct use of the cases is here easily obscured, and *he* is used where the rules of grammar would lead us to expect *him*, and conversely. The examples of complete displacement are here, as above, starred :—

Chauc., *B.*, 1025, "So vertuous a lyver in my lyf Ne saugh I never, such as *sche*" | *ibid.*, *M. P.*, 3, 984, "Ne swich as *she* ne knew I noon" | Udall, *Roister*, 33, "for such as *thou*" (compare *ibid.*, 44) | Marl., *Tamb.*, 1814, "depend

on such weake helps as *we*" | *ibid.*, 1877, "for these, and such as *we* our selues, For vs" | Greene, *Friar B.*, 12, 66, "I do love the lord, As *he* that's second to thyself in love" (relat. attr.) | Sh., *Rom.*, 239, "For men so old as *we*" | *Shrew*, i., 2, 65, "'twixt such friends as *wee*" | *As*, ii., 5, 58, "Heere shall he see grosse fooles as *he*" | *Wint. T.*, ii., 1, 191 | *Ant.*, iii., 3, 14, "is shee as tall as **me?*" | Field., *T. J.*, ii., 115, "you are not as good as me" | Trollope, *Duke's Ch.*, iii., 31 (a young lord writes), "the Carbottle people were quite as badly off as **us*" | Orig. Engl., 42 (vulg.), "some people wot lives [= who live] on the same floor as **us*, only they are poorer than **us*" | Thomson, *Rule Britannia*, "The nations not so blest as *thee*, Must in their turn to tyrants fall" | Meredith, *Egoist*, 192, "What was the right of so miserable a creature as *she* to excite disturbances?"

After *such as* the nom. is now the rule:—

Tennyson, *In Mem.*, xxxiv., p. 256, "What then were God to such as *I?*" | *ibid.*, p. 419, "Gawain, was this quest for thee?" "Nay, lord," said Gawain, "not for such as *I*" | Rob. Browning, iii., 78, "The land has none left such as *he* on the bier" | Mrs. Browning, *Sonnets f. t. Port.*, viii., "who hast . . . laid them on the outside of the wall, for such as

*I* to take" | Ward, *Dav. Grieve*, i., 193, "religion was not for such as *he*" | Buchanan, *Wand. Jew*, 74, "The Roman wars not with such foes as *he*" | Co. Doyle, *Sherl. H.*, i., 181, "God keep you out of the clutches of such a man as *he*".

Even after *as well as* the confusion is found, though in the mouths of vulgar persons :—

Sh., *Meas.*, ii., 1, 75, "I will detest my selfe also, as well as *she*" | Field., *T. J.*, iii., 121, "Dost fancy I don't know that as well as *thee?*"

The word *like* is normally used with the dative, but on account of its signification being often identical with that of *as*, the nominative is sometimes found :—

Sh., *Rom.*, 1992 (iii., 5, 83), "And yet no man like *he* doth greeue my heart," evidently on account of the following verb, whose subject in a way *he* is; compare, on the other hand, *ibid.*, 1754-6, "wert thou as young as I . . . doting like *me*, and like *me* banished" | R. Wintle, *A Regular Scandal*, 35, "Yes, if it was a sweet young girl . . . and not one like *I*".

59. (161) Examples with *than* :—

Chaucer, *L. G. W.* (B), 476, "To me ne fond I better noon than *ye*" | Sh., *Cor.*, iv., 5, 170, "but a greater soldier then *he*, you wot one" | *As*, i., 1, 172, "my soule . . . hates nothing more then **he*" (compare *Troil.*, ii., 3, 199; *Cymb.*, v., 3, 72, "then *we*" (obj.) (relat. attr.) |

Field., *T. J.*, i., 49, "My sister, though many years younger than **me*, is at least old enough to be at the age of discretion" | *ibid.*, iii., 129, "you are younger than **me*" | *ibid.*, i., 221 (vulg.), "gentle folks are but flesh and blood no more than *us* servants" | Byron, ii., 351, "none Can less have said or more have done Than **thee*, Mazeppa" | *ibid.*, iv., 213, "Yet he seems mightier far than **them*" | iv., 223, "Higher things than ye are slaves; and higher Than **them* or ye would be so" | v., 226, "than **him*" | Shelley, 237, "I am . . . mightier than **thee*" | Thackeray, *Van. F.*, 412, "she fancies herself better than you and *me*" | Trollope, *Duke's Ch.*, i., 221 (a lady says), "[She should be] two inches shorter than *me*".

This use of the acc. after *than*, of which Bishop Lowth in his grammar (1762, p. 145) is already able to quote many examples from the writings of Swift, Lord Bolingbroke, Prior, etc., is now so universal as to be considered the normal construction; that is, to the general feeling *than* is a preposition as well as a conjunction. Even grammarians acknowledge the use of the accusative in this connexion,[1] though their reasons are not always of the best; thus W. Smith and D. Hall[2] mention: "A stone is heavy, and the

[1] Hyde Clarke, p. 132; Alford, *Queen's Engl.*, 111 ff.; see also Storm, *E. Philol.*, p. 233.

[2] *A School Manual of Engl. Grammar*, 1873, p. 119.

sand weighty; but a fool's wrath is heavier than them both" (Prov., xxvii., 3), as "a construction founded on the Latin," namely, the ablative (without *quam*), to express the second member of a comparison (major Scipione), with which the English idiom has of course nothing whatever to do. Nevertheless, many grammarians, and consequently many authors, reject this natural use of the accusative, and I think I am justified in considering the nominatives in some, at least, of the following examples as called forth by a more or less artificial reaction against the natural tendencies of the language:—

> Carlyle, *Heroes*, 93, "the care of Another than *he*" | Troll., *Duke's Ch.*, i., 136, "he had known none more vile or more false than *I*" | G. Eliot, *Mill*, i., 186, "I have known much more highly-instructed persons than *he* make inferences quite as wide" | Tennyson, *Becket*, 1, "But we must have a mightier man than *he* for his successor" | Meredith, *Egoist*, 141, "if I could see you with a worthier than *I*" | Buchanan, *Jew*, 87, "Naming the names of lesser Gods than *I*" | Co. Doyle, *Sherl. H.*, i., 53, "I love and am loved by a better man than *he*".

The accusative is always used in *than whom* (found in Shakespeare, *Love's L.*, iii., 180, in Milton, etc.); Alford is right in observing that *than who* is here excluded because the expression does not admit of an elliptical construction. I only once remember

having found *than who*, namely in the sentence, "Mr. Geo. Withers, than who no one has written more sensibly on this subject," and then it occurs in the book on *The King's English* (p. 338) by Mr. Washington Moon, who is constantly regulating his own and others' language by what in his view *ought* to be, rather than what really *is* the usage of the English nation.

### III. Anacoluthia.

**60.** (162) Of the different forms of anacoluthia we have here first to do with that which results when a speaker begins a sentence with some word which takes a prominent place in his thought, but has not yet made up his mind with regard to its syntactical connexion; if it is a word inflected in the cases he provisionally puts it in the nominative, but is then often obliged by an after-correction[1] to insert a pronoun indicating the case the word should have been in. This phenomenon is extremely frequent in the colloquial forms of all languages, but grammarians blame it and in literary language it is generally avoided. I shall first give some examples where the case employed is correct or the fault is at any rate not visible:—

[1] I translate thus Wegener's expression, "nachträgliche correctur" (see his *Grundfragen des Sprachlebens*, Halle, 1885, p. 72, where he deals with such German sentences as "das haus, da bin ich rein gegangen," etc.). The opposite process of placing the pronoun first is also common; see, for instance, Carlyle, *Heroes*, 19, "*it* is strange enough this old Norse view of nature".

*Ancren Riwle*, 332, "þe beste mon of al þisse worlde 3if ure Louerd demde him al efter rihtwisnesse ⁊ nout efter merci, wo schulde *him* iwurden" | Chauc., *B.*, 4268, "oon of hem, in sleping as he lay, *Him* mette a wonder dreem" | Sh., *As*, iv., 1, 77, "verie good orators when they are out, *they* will spit" | *ibid.*, iv., 1, 177, "that woman that cannot make her fault her husbands occasion, let *her* neuer nurse her childe".

Next I quote some instances in which the nominative (or, in the first sentence, acc.) might be also caused by relative attraction (§ 52):—

*Oros.*, 78, 31, "*þæt gewinn* þæt his fæder astealde he . . . for *þæm* V gear scipa worhte" | *Cura P.*, 29, 2, "*Se* ðe god ne ongit, ne ongit god *hine*"[1] | *ibid.*, 31, 16, "*Se* ðe ænigne ðissa ierminga besuicð, him wære betere," etc. | Chaucer, *B.*, 4621, "For *he* that winketh, whan he sholde see, Al wilfully, God lat *him* never thee!" | Chaucer, *Morris*, iii., 165, "for certes *he* that . . . hath to gret presumpcioun, *him* schal ꝥvyl bitide" | *ibid.*, iii., 196, "*He* that most curteysly comaundeth, to *him* men most obeyen" | Malory, 150, "*ye* that be soo wel borne a man . . ., there is no lady in the world to good for *yow*" |

[1] This is the regular O. E. construction in relative clauses; compare the modern translation, "*He* who knows not God, God knows not *him*".

Matt., xii., 36, "*Every idle word* that men speak, they shall give account *thereof* in the day of judgment" | Sh., *Cor.*, i., 4, 28, "*He* that retires, Ile take *him* for a Volce" (compare *Haml.*, iii., 2, 252) | Sh., *R. III.*, iii., 2, 58, "that *they* which brought me in my masters hate, I liue to looke vpon *their* tragedie"[1] | Sh., *H. V.*, iv., 3, 35, "*he* which hath no stomacke to this fight, let *him* depart, his passport shall be made" | Carlyle, *Heroes*, 9, "*He* that can discern the loveliness of things, we call *him* Poet".

There is no relative attraction in the following sentences:—

*Oros.*, 24, 7, "*Seo* ús fyrre *Ispania, hyre* is be westan garsecg" | *ibid.*, 188, 26, "Athium *þæt folc him* geþuhte" | Sh., *Meas.*, v., 134, "But yesternight my lord, *she* and that fryer I saw *them* at the prison" | Sh., *Wint. T.*, iii., 2, 98, "My second ioy, And first fruits of my body, from *his* presence I am bar'd".[1]

Sometimes no corrective pronoun follows:—

Sh., *Meas.*, v., 531, "*She* Claudio that you wrong'd, looke you restore" | Sh., *Wives*, iv., 4, 87, "and *he* my husband best of all affects" | Sh., *Tim.*, iv., 3, 39, "*Shee*, whom the spittle-house and vlcerous sores Would cast the

[1] In the appendix to the next chapter I shall have occasion to mention these and similar ways of expressing the genitive of word-groups; see especially § 147.

gorge at, this embalmes" [her; in the first folio a different punctuation is used] | R Browning, *Tauchn.*, i., 235, "*She*, men would have to be your mother once, Old Gandolf envied me, so fair she was!"

**61.** (163) When two or more words are in *apposition* to each other it often happens that the appositum does not follow the case of the first word; the speaker forgets the case he has just employed and places the appositum loosely without any connexion with the preceding. M. Sohrauer[1] gives some O. E. examples (to *Nichodeme, an* ðæra Judeiscra ealdra), to which may be added:—

*Chron.*, 984 A, "seo halgung *þæs æfterfilgendan bisceopes Ælfheages, se* ðe oðran naman wæs geciged Godwine" (rel. attraction!) | Sweet, *A. S. Reader*, 15, 7, "fram Brytta *cyninge, Ceadwalla geciged*" | *ibid.*, l. 45, "*sumne arwurðne bisceop, Aidan gehaten*" | *ibid.*, l. 101, "to Westseaxan *kyninge, Cynegyls gehaten*" | *ibid.*, l. 144, "on *scrine*, of seolfre *asmiþod*".

This is extremely common in O. E. with participles; in more recent periods it is found in many other cases as well:—

Chauc., *B.*, 1877, "prey eek for *us, we* sinful folk unstable" | Chauc., *M. P.*, 5, 421, "Beseching *her* of mercy and of grace, As *she*

[1] *Kleine Beiträge zur Altengl. Grammatik*, p. 29; see also Mätzner, *Gramm.*, iii., 343 ff.

that is my lady sovereyne" | Chauc., *Morris*, iii., 12, 325, "to folwe *hire*, as *she* that is goddesse" | Sh., 1 *H. IV.*, i., 2, 16, "by *Phoebus*, *hee*, that wand'ring knight" | Sh., *Love's L.*, iv., 3, 7, "this loue . . . kils sheep; it kils *mee*, *I* a sheep" | Sh., *Wint. T.*, v., 1, 86, "Prince Florizell . . . with his princesse (*she* The fairest I haue yet beheld)" | Sh., 1 *H. IV.*, ii., 4, 114, "I am not yet of *Percies* mind, the *Hotspurre* of the North, *he* that killes me some sixe or seauen dozen of Scots"[1] | Shelley, *Poet. W.*, 250, "Know ye not *me*, The Titan? *he* who made his agony the barrier to your else all-conquering foe?"

Relative attraction may, of course, have also been at work in some of these sentences; and the following example (which I quote from A. Gil, *Logonomia*, 1619, p. 77) might be accounted for in no less than three of my paragraphs (52, 54, 61). This illustrates the complexity of the mutual relations of grammatical categories:—

"Sic etiam casus inter duo verba, nunc cum hoc, nunc cu*m* illo construitur: vt, Let Tomas cum in, J mën hĭ ðat käm yisterdai: aut I mën him".

What is the reason of the accusative in Sh., *Cymb.*, v., 4, 70, "we came, our parents and *vs* twaine"?

**62.** (164) There is a peculiar form of anacoluthia,

[1] Compare, for a fuller treatment of nominatives in apposition to genitives, § 120 ff. below.

which for want of a better name I shall term *unconnected subject.* In English this phenomenon is not confined to those exclamations of surprise or remonstrance in which it is common in many languages (Dan., "Du göre det! Han. i Paris?" French, "Toi faire ça! Lui avare?" Italian, "Io far questo!" Latin, "Mene incepto desistere victam?" etc.), but is found in other cases as well, especially after *and*, by which the subject is more or less loosely connected with a preceding sentence.[1] I shall here in the first place give some quotations in which the case employed is the same as would have been used had the thought been expressed fully and in more regular forms:—

Sh., *Love's L.*, iii., 191, "What? *I* loue! *I* sue! *I* seeke a wife!" | *ibid.*, 202, "And *I* to sigh for her, to watch for her," etc. | *Meas.*, ii., 2, 5, "all ages smack of this vice, and *he* To die for't" | *As*, iii., 2, 161, "Heauen would that shee these gifts should haue, and *I* to liue and die her slaue" (= I should) | *Tim.*, iii., 1, 50, "Is't possible the world should so much differ, And *we* aliue that liued?" | *Macb.*, i., 7, 58 (455), "If we should faile?—We faile!" (Here, however, the best reading seems to be "We faile." with a full stop, the verb being taken as an indicative) | *R. II.*, iv., 1, 129, "And shall the figure of God's Maiestie . . . Be iudg'd by subiect, and in-

[1] The phenomenon was more frequent from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century than it is now.

ferior breathe, And *he* himself not present?" | Milton, *S. A.*, 1480, "Much rather I [Manoa] shall choose To live the poorest in my tribe, than richest, And *he* in that calamitous prison left" [ = if Samson is left . . .] | Field., *T. J.*, ii., 85, "*A young woman* of your age, and unmarried, to talk of inclinations!" | G. Eliot, *Mill*, ii., 149, "*I* say anything disrespectful of Dr. Kenn? Heaven forbid!" | *ibid.*, ii., 307, "Could anything be more detestable? A girl so much indebted to her friends . . . to lay designs of winning a young man's affections away from her own cousin?"

But in the following instances the nom. is used, although the construction, if regularly completed, would have led to the use of an accusative:—

Chaucer, *E.*, 105, "I dar the better aske of yow a space Of audience to shewen our requeste, And *ye*, my lord, to doon ryght as yow leste" | Malory, 71, "hym thought no worship to have a knyght at suche auaille, *he* to be on horsback and *he* on foot" | Sh., *As*, i., 2, 279, "What he is indeede, More suites you to conceiue, then *I* to speake of" (Kellner[1] quotes from Sh. also *Err.*, i., 1, 33; *All's*, ii., 1, 186; *Timon*, iv., 3, 266) | *Cor.*, iii., 2, 83, "the soft way which . . . Were fit for

[1] Introd. to *Blanchardyn*, p. lxvii. ff.; Kellner's explanation does not seem very clear.

thee to vse, as *they* to clayme" (compare also *Cor.*, iii., 2, 124, and ii., 2, 54).

**63.** (165) Similarly where no infinitive is used, but a participle or some other word :—

[Chaucer, *F.*, 700, "What coude a sturdy husbond more deuyse To preue hir wyfhood and hir stedfastnesse, And *he* continuing euer in sturdinesse?"] | Mal., 95, "whan Balen sawe her lye so with the fowlest knyghte that euer he sawe and *she* a fair lady, thenne Balyn wente thurgh alle the chambers" | Marlowe, *Tamb.*, 244, "Me thinks I see kings kneeling at his feet, And *he* with frowning browes and fiery lookes Spurning their crownes" | Sh., *Romeo*, 537, "good manners shall lie all in one or two men's hands and *they* vnwasht too" | *Lear*, iii., 6, 117, "that which makes me bend makes the king bow, *He* childed as *I* fathered!" | Field., *T. J.*, ii., 249, "I thought it hard that there should be so many of them, all upon one poore man, and *he* too in chains" | Meredith, *Trag. Com.*, 165, "let her be hunted and I not by [and let me not be by; when I am not by], beast it is with her" | Ward, *David Grieve*, iii., 133, "It made her mad to see their money chuckled away to other people, and *they* getting no good of it".

In some of these sentences the construction might be called a kind of apposition; in others we have

something closely resembling the absolute participle, of which more will be said below, § 81; the use of an "unconnected subject" may have favoured the substitution of the modern "absolute nominative" for the old "absolute dative".

**64.** (166) Sometimes the phenomenon mentioned in § 62, of an unconnected subject with an infinitive, corresponds very nearly to the Latin accusative with the infinitive, only the nominative is used:— [1]

> Malory, 40, "this is my counceill . . . that we lete puruey x kny3tes men of good fame, & *they to kepe* this swerd" | *ibid.*, 60, "for it is better that we slee a coward than thorow a coward alle *we* to be slayne" | *ibid.*, 453 (quoted by Kellner), "*Thow* to lye by our moder is to muche shame for vs to suffre" | *ibid.*, 133, "And thenne hadde she me deuysed to be kyng in this land, and soo to regne, and *she* to be my quene".

But this use of a nominative with the infinitive does not occur often enough to be a permanent feature of the English language.

[1] Where the subject is a noun it is impossible to see which case is used; comp. *Ancr. R.*, 364, "is hit nu wisdom mon to don so wo him suluen?" | Malory, 67, "it is gods wyll youre body to be punysshed" | *ibid.*, 92, "it is the customme of my countrey a knyghte alweyes to kepe his wepen with hym" | Sh., *Wint. T.*, v., 142, "Which . . . Is all as monstrous . . . As my Antigonus to breake his graue". Modern Engl. here has *for*: "it is wisdom for a man to do . . ."; compare the full and able treatment of this use of *for*, in C. Stoffel's *Studies in English*, p. 49 ff.

### IV. Influence from the Nouns.

**65.** (167) The absolute absence of any formal distinction between the nominative and the objective cases in the nouns and adjectives, as well as in the neuter pronouns *it*, *that*, and *what*, must of course do a great deal towards weakening the sense of case distinctions in general.

**66.** (168) This is especially seen to be the case where the pronouns are themselves taken substantively, for then the normal case-inflexion is naturally suspended. This happens in two ways: either a pronoun is plucked from its context and quoted by itself, as in these examples:—

> Sh., *All's*, ii., 1, 81, "write to her a loue-line. What *her* is this?" | Tennyson, *Becket*, act i., sc. 1, "It much imports me I should know her name. What *her?* The woman that I followed hither" | *Frank Fairlegh*, ii., 19, "so he left her there. 'And who may *her* be?' inquired Freddy, setting grammar at defiance";

or else a pronoun is used exactly like a noun, *he* or *she* signifying a male or a female respectively. This is extremely common in Shakespeare (see Al. Schmidt's *Sh. Lex.*); a few examples will here suffice:—

> Bale, *Three Lawes*, 1439, "I am non other, but even the very *he*" | Sh., *Tw. N.*, i., 5, 259, "Lady, you are the cruell'st *shee* alive" | *Wint. T.*, iv., 4, 360, "to load my *shee* with

knackes" | *As*, iii., 2, 10, "carue on euery tree The faire, the chaste and vnexpressiue *shee*" | *Love's L.*, v., 2, 469, "we . . . woo'd but the signe of *she*" | *Cymb.*, i., 3, 29, "the *shees* of Italy".

So also as the first part of a compound: *a she angel, you she knight errant* (Sh., *Wint.*, iv., 4, 211; 2 *H. IV.*, v. 4, 25); comp.:—

Byron, v., 230, "The pardon'd slave of she Sardanapalus" | *ibid.*, v., 245, "wearing Lydian Omphale's She-garb".

But in the nineteenth century it is often the objective case that is used thus substantively:—

Troll., *Duke's Ch.*, i., 94, "that other *him* is the person she loves" | *ibid.*, 94, "reference to some *him*" | Gilbert, *Orig. Plays*, 1884, 129 (vulgar), "Mr. Fitz Partington shall introduce him.—It ain't a *him*, it's a *her*."

In philosophical language, the *me* and the *thee* are often used corresponding to the German *das ich*, *das du*:—

Carlyle, *Sartor*, 35, "Who am I; what is this ME?" | *ibid.*, 37, "our ME the only reality" | *ibid.*, 39, "that strange THEE of thine" | *ibid.*, 92, "a certain orthodox Anthromorphism connects my *Me* with all *Thees* in bond of Love" | Ruskin, *Selections*, i., 503, "But this poor miserable *Me!*" | Meredith, *Egoist*, 489, "the miserable little *me* to be taken up and loved after tearing myself to pieces!"

Yet the nom. is sometimes found :—

Carlyle, *Sartor*, 132, "the THOU" | Mrs. Ward, *Dav. Grieve*, iii., 86, "Was there any law—any knowledge—any *I?*" | L. Morris, *Poet. Works*, 121, "And the *I* is the giver of light, and without it the master must die".

An English friend of mine once told me about a clergyman who in one of his sermons spoke constantly of *your immortal I*, but was sadly misunderstood by the congregation, who did not see why the *eye* should be more immortal than any other part of the body. It is perhaps to avoid such misinterpretations that the Latin form is sometimes used, as in Thack., *Pend.*, iii., 363, "every man here has his secret *ego* likely".

**67.** (169) When the pronoun is preceded by an adjective, it is sometimes inflected in the usual way ("poor *I* had sent a hundred thousand pounds to America; would you kill poor *me?*" and similar examples are quoted by Storm, *E. Philol.*, 208, note); but in other places we find it treated like a substantive :—

Sh., *Sonn.* 72, "upon deceased *I*" | *ibid.*, *Cor.*, v., 3, 103, "to poore *we*, Thine enmities most capitall".

In exclamations *me* is always used :—

Sh., *Sonn.* 37, "then ten times happy *me!*" | Thack., *Van. F.*, 120, "Poor little *me!*"

Compare the use of *me* in other exclamations : *O(h) me! Woe me! Ah me! Ay me!* (Milt., *P. L.*, iv.,

86, etc.), *Aye me detested!* (Sh., *Tw. N.*, v., 142), *Alas me!* (Keats, *Eve of St. Agnes*, xii.), *Me miserable!* (Milt., *P. L.*, iv., 73), etc. The use of *me* in *dear me! gracious me!* and other apologies for oaths is probably due to the analogy of the corresponding use of the pronoun as an object after a verb, as in *bless me!* etc. So perhaps also in Shak., 1 *H. IV.*, ii., 3, 97, "*Gods me*, my horse".

## V. Position.

**68.** (170) Word-order is to no small extent instrumental in bringing about shiftings of the original relation between two cases. In Old English prose the subject is already placed before the verb in nearly every sentence; the exceptions are almost the same as in Modern German or Danish; thus inversion is the rule after adverbs such as *þa* (while, curiously enough, the subject precedes the verb where the clause is introduced by *hwæt þa* or *efne þa*). By-and-by these exceptions disappear or are reduced to a minimum, so that in Modern English the order, subject, verb, object, is practically invariable.[1] Cooper defines the difference between the nom. and the acc. in the pronouns in the following manner:[2] "*I, thou, he, she, we, ye, they*, verbis anteponuntur, *me, thee, him, her, us, you, them*, postponuntur verbis & præpositionibus". However naïve the grammarian may find this definition, it contains a

[1] Also in sentences like *Does he love her?* so far as the real verb is concerned.

[2] See his *Gramm. Linguæ Anglicanæ*, 1685, p. 121.

good deal of truth; this is the perception of the distinction between the two forms which in the popular instinct often overrides the older perception according to which the use of *I* and *me* was independent of position.

**69.** (171) *Before the verb* the nom. comes to be used in many cases where the acc. was required by the rules of the old language. Besides a few isolated instances, that may be more or less doubtful,[1] this is the case with *who*, as the natural position of this pronoun is always at the beginning of the sentence, the verb, as a rule, following immediately after it. For Middle English examples of *who* and *whom* see below, § 76; it would be an easy matter to find hundreds of examples from the Modern English period; I shall here print only a few selected from my own collections to supplement the numerous examples adduced by Storm (*Engl. Philol.*, 211 ff.):—

> Marl., *Tamb.*, 4190, "*UUho* haue ye there, my Lordes?" | Greene, *Friar B.*, 1, 143, "Espy her loves, and *who* she liketh best" | Sh., *Tw. N.*, ii., 5, 108, "Ioue knowes I loue, but *who*, Lips do not mooue, no man must know" | *ibid.*, *Wint.*, v., 1, 109, "[she might] make proselytes of *who* she but bid follow" | *ibid.*, i., 2, 331, "my sonne (*who* I doe thinke is mine, and loue as mine)" | *Spectator*, No.

[1] See, for instance, Sh., *Meas.*, iii., 1, 221, "*Shee* should this Angelo haue married: was affianced to her [by] oath, and the nuptiall appointed," where most editors emend *she* to *her*.

266, "*who* should I see there but the most artful procuress?" | *ibid.*, 59, "*who* should I see in the lid of it [a snuff-box] but the Doctor?" | Dryden, "Tell who loves *who*" | Sheridan, *Dram. W.*, 39, "*who* can he take after?" | *ibid.*, 48, "*who* can he mean by that?" (cf. *ibid.*, 69) | Thack., *Van. F.*, 74, "*Who*, I exclaimed, can we consult but Miss P.?" | Mrs. H. Ward, *Rob. Elsm.*, ii., 141 (Lady Helen says), "*Who* does this dreadful place belong to?"

**70.** (172) As regards Shakespeare's use of *who* in the objective case, it must suffice to refer to Al. Schmidt's *Lexicon;* under the interrogative pronoun he gives fifteen quotations for the use in question, and then adds an *etc.*, which, to any one familiar with the incomparable accuracy and completeness of Schmidt's work, is certain proof that examples abound; finally he names nineteen places where the old editions do not agree. Under the relative pronoun he adduces twelve quotations for *who* as an acc., followed again by an *etc.*, and by eleven references to passages in which the oldest editions give different readings. It is well worth noting that where such variations of reading are found it is nearly always the earliest edition that has *who* and the later editions that find fault with this and replace it by *whom;* most modern editors and reprinters add the *-m* everywhere in accordance with the rules of grammars, showing thereby that they hold in

greater awe the schoolmasters of their own childhood than the poet of all the ages.[1]

Shakespeare also uses *whoever* as an accusative; *whomever* does not occur in his works; he also sometimes uses *who* after a preposition (see Abbott, § 274, and add to his examples, *R. III.*, i., 3, 54), but this seems now obsolete, because the natural word-order is to place the preposition at the end of the sentence, as Shakespeare does himself in numerous passages; for instance, *As*, iii., 2, 327, "Ile tell you who Time ambles withall, who Time trots withall, who Time gallops withal, and who he stands stil withal". It seems, then, as if the last refuge of the form *whom* is the combination *than whom*, where it had originally nothing to do; but as this combination belongs more to literary than to everyday language, *who* is now to be considered almost as a common case; compare what Sweet writes to Storm: "I think many educated people never use *whom* at all; always *who*".

**71.** (173) A great many verbs which in Old English were impersonal have become personal in Modern English, and one of the causes which most contributed to this change was certainly word-order. The dative, indicating the person concerned, was

[1] Schmidt has five instances from Shakespeare of *whom* (relative) for *who*: one is after *than*; three might be added to those I gave above in § 53; the fifth (*Temp.*, v., 76) is an anacoluthia, which was corrected by Rowe.

generally placed immediately before the impersonal verb; the reason of this position was undoubtedly the greater interest felt for the person, which caused the word indicating him to take a prominent place in the sentence as well as in the consciousness of the speaker. And so this "psychological subject," as it has been termed, eventually became the grammatical subject as well. But other circumstances favoured the same tendency. Some verbs in O. E. admitted of both a personal and impersonal construction, *e.g.*, *recan*, "to care"; compare from the thirteenth century the *Ancr. Riwle*, p. 104, where one MS. has "ȝ if heo beoð feor, *me* ne recched," and another "þach ha beon feor, naut *I* ne recche". In one case, two originally distinct verbs grew to be identical in pronunciation by a purely phonetic development, namely O. E. *þyncan*, "seem" (German *dünken*), impersonal, and *þencan*, "think" (Germ. *denken*), personal. In the former the vowel *y* by the usual process lost its lip-rounding and so became *i*; in the latter *e* was raised to *i* before the back nasal consonant, as in O. E. *streng*, Mod. *string*, O. E. *hlence*, mod. *link*, O. E. *Englaland*, Mod. *England*, pronounced with [i]; compare also the history of the words *mingle*, *wing*, *cringe*, *singe*, etc.

The number of verbs that have passed from the impersonal to the personal construction is too great for me here to name them all; I shall refer to the lists given by Koch, *Gram.*, ii., § 109; Mätzner, ii., p. 198 ff.; Einenkel, *Streifzüge*, p. 114 ff.; and Kellner, *Blanchardyn*, p. xlvii. ff. But I shall supple-

ment the remarks of these scholars by attempting to analyse the psychological agencies at work in the transition ; I shall for this purpose print those examples from my own collection which seem to be the most illustrative, confining myself generally to only a few of the most usual verbs coming under this head.

72. (174) The original construction will be seen from the following quotations :—

*Ancr. R.*, 238, "*me luste* slepen" | Chauc., *B.*, 1048, "*hir liste* nat to daunce" | Bale, *Three L.*, 1264, "And maye do what *him lust*" | *Ancr. R.*, 338, "hit mei lutel *liken God* [dative], and misliken ofte" | Chauc., *M. P.*, 22, 63, "al that *hir list and lyketh*" | *ibid.*, *Morr.*, iii., 145, "whan *him liketh*" | Malory, 100, "I shold fynde yow a damoysel . . . that shold *lyke yow & plese yow*" [the two verbs are synonymous] | Greene, *Friar B.*, 4, 55, "this motion *likes me* well" | Sh., *Haml.*, ii., 2, 80, "It *likes vs* well" | *ibid.*, *Troil.*, v., 2, 102, "I doe not like this fooling . . . But that that *likes* not *you pleases me* best" | Milton, *Reason of Church Governm.*, ii., "much better would it *like him* to be the messenger of gladness" | Thack., *Van. F.*, 89, "Some [women] are made to scheme, and some to love: and I wish any respected bachelor . . . may take the sort that best *likes him*".[1]

[1] *Like* is here used in the old sense of *please;* this is now-a-

Chauc., *M. P.*, 3, 276 (and very often), "*me mette* [I dreamt] so inly swete a sweven" | *Ancr. R.*, 136, "hit schal *punche þe* swete" | Chauc., *B.*, 4578, "*hem thoughte* hir herte breke" | Malory, 65 (four times), "*hym thoughte*" | Latimer (*Skeat's Spec.*, xxi., 91), "*me thynketh* I heare" | "*methinks*, *methought*(*s*)".

**73.** (175) In many cases it is impossible to decide whether the verb is used personally or impersonally, as, for example, when it stands with a noun or with one of the pronouns that do not distinguish cases. It goes without saying that the frequency of such combinations has largely assisted in bringing about the change to modern usage. A few examples will suffice:—

*Ancr. R.*, 286, "hwon *þe heorte liked* wel, þeonne cumeð up a deuocioun" | Chauc., *Morr.*, iii., 147, "al that *hir housbonde likede* for to seye" | *ibid.*, *B.*, 477, "*God list* to shewe his wonderful miracle" | *ibid.*, *Morr.*, iii., 145, "hem *that liste* not to heere his wordes" | *ibid.*, *B.*, 4302, "how *Kenelm mette* a thing".

The construction is similarly not evident in the case of an accus. with the infinitive:—

days extremely rare. In Middle English *like* was often used with *to*: Chauc., *Morr.*, iii., 191, "what day that it like *yow* and *unto* your noblesse" | *ibid.*, *E.*, 345, "It lyketh *to* your fader and *to* me". Compare Chauc., *Morr.*, iii., 172, "it displeseth *to* the jugges," but 183, "displese God".

Chauc., *M. P.*, 5, 108, "That *made me to mete*" | *ibid.*, 115, "[thou] *madest me* this sweven *for to mete*".

**74.** (176) The transition to the new construction is shown by the possibility of joining two synonyms, of which one has always been a personal verb:—

*Prov. of Alfred* (*Specimens*, i., p. 148), "þat ye alle a-drede vre dryhten crist, *luuyen* hine and *lykyen*" | Malory, 35, "the kynge *lyked and loued* this lady wel".

As early as Chaucer we find passages in which a nominative is understood from an impersonally constructed verb to a following verb of personal construction:—

*B.*, 3731, "For drede of this, *him* thoughte that he deyde, And [he] ran into a gardin, him to hyde" | *M. P.*, 7, 200, "*her* liste him 'dere herte' calle And [she] was so meek" | *M. P.*, 5, 165, "Yit lyketh *him* at the wrastling for to be, And [he] demeth yit wher he do bet or he".

Sometimes both constructions are used almost in a breath:—[1]

Ch., *L. G. W.*, 1985, "*me* is as wo For him as ever *I* was for any man" | Malory, 74, "Arthur loked on the swerd, and *lyked*[2] it

[1] See also below, § 91.

[2] This and the just mentioned are the only examples of personal (or rather half-personal) use of *lyke* I have noted in Malory, who generally uses the acc. (dat.) with it, *e.g.*, 61, "it lyketh you" | 157, "yf hit lyke yow".

passynge wel; whether *lyketh yow* better, said Merlyn, the suerd or the scaubard? *Me lyketh* better the swerd, sayd Arthur" | Greene, *Friar B.*, 6, 138, "Peggy, how *like you* [nom.] this?—What *likes my lord* is pleasing unto me" | Sh., *Troil.*, above, § 72.

In Ch., *M. P.*, 5, 114, "[thou] dauntest whom *thee* lest," some of the manuscripts read *thou*, probably in order to avoid the two accusatives after each other.

**75.** (177) Sometimes the impersonal expression is followed by a connexion of words that is strictly appropriate only after a personal verb:—

*Ancr. R.*, 332, "Ase ofte ase ich am ischriuen, euer *me þuncheð me* unschriuen (videor mihi non esse confessus)" | *ibid.*, 196, "swetest *him þuncheð ham* [the nuns: they appear to him [God] most lovely]" | Chauc., *E.*, 106, "For certes, lord, so wel *vs lyketh yow* And all your werk and ever han doon".

The last quotation is of especial interest as showing a sort of blending of no less than three constructions: the impersonal construction with *us lyketh* as a third personal sg. with no object, the old personal construction, where *like* means "to please," *us lyken ye*,[1] and finally the modern personal use, *we lyken yow;* the continuation "and ever han doon" (= "and we have always liked you") shows that the last construction was at least half present to Chaucer's mind.

[1] Not *us lyketh ye*, as Prof. Skeat would have it in his note to the passage.

Other blendings of a similar nature are found with *think; me thinks* and *I think* are confused in *me thinke*, found, for instance, in a sermon of Latimer's (*Skeat's Specimens*, xxi., 176);[1] *thinks thee?* and *thinkst thou?* give *thinkst thee?* in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, v., 2, 63 (folio; the old quartos have *thinke thee;* some modern editors write *thinks't thee*, as if contracted for *thinks it thee;* but this is hardly correct, as this verb is very seldom used with *it*, at least when a personal pronoun is added).

**76.** (178) Note particularly *who* in the following sentences:—

*Ancr. R.*, 38, "*hwo* se *þuncheð* to longe lete þe psalmes" | Chauc., *B.*, 3509, "Hir batailes, *who* so *list* hem for to rede . . . Let him vnto my maister Petrark go" | Ch., *Troilus*, i., 398, "and *who*-so *liste* it here".

These we may consider either the oldest examples of *who* as an accusative (centuries before any hitherto pointed out), or else the oldest examples of O. E. *þyncan* and *lystan* used personally.[2] I suppose, how-

[1] Compare also *Roister Doister*, 71, "me thinke they make preparation . . . me think they dare not," where *thinke* seems to be in the plural on account of the following *they*.

[2] The Chaucer quotations given by Einenkel (*Streifzüge*, p. 115) are too dubious to prove the personal use of *lesten:* iii., 1 (= F. 689), the Ellesm. MS. reads, "For he to vertu *listneth* not entende" [what is *entende* here? a noun? an adv.? (in the ende??). I understand it no more than did those scribes who placed *listeth* instead of *listneth*]; iv., 136, has *that*, which may as well be acc. as dat.; finally, ii., 268, proves nothing, as some

ever, that the correct way of viewing these sentences is to say that the two tendencies, neither of which was strong enough to operate by itself, here combined to bring about a visible result.

**77.** (179) Here I shall finally give a few examples of the prevailing personal use:—

Sh., *Rom.*, 37, "as *they list*" | Milton, *P. L.*, iv., 804, "as *he* list" | *Gesta Rom.* (ab. 1440, quoted by Kellner), "*þou* shalt *like* it" (in Elizabethan language also *like of*) | Greene, *Friar B.*, 10, 45, "if *thou please*" | Sh., *Shrew*, iv., 3, 70, "as *I please*" [1] | Chauc., *B.*, 3930, "And eek a sweuen vpon a nyghte *he mette*".

In some cases the personal construction has not become universal, as in the case of *ail* (O. E. *eglan*). Though Dr. Murray is able to show the personal use of the word in a quotation as early as 1425, and though Shakespeare never uses it impersonally (comp. also Marlowe, *Jew*, 1193, "What ayl'st thou"), the old construction still survives. The reason is undoubtedly the fact that the verb is so very often used in the

MSS. read "if *the* list," not *thou*. Kellner, *Blanchard.*, xlix., quotes Einenkel's two examples, showing that he has found no more examples in Chaucer, while he has some from Caxton. Compare, however, *M. P.*, 7, 200, quoted above, § 176.

[1] Milton, *P. L.*, vi., 351, shows the personal use of *please* and the impersonal use of *like*: "As *they please*, They limb themselves, and colour, shape, and size, Assume, as *likes them* best, condense or rare". Compare *ibid.*, vi., 717.

common formula: *What ails him?* (her, etc.), where the personal pronoun is placed *after* the verb; see, *e.g.*, Sirith, 337; Chauc., *B.*, 1170, 1975, 4080; *H.*, 16; *M. P.*, 3, 449, etc., etc.; Tennyson, p. 132: "What ail'd *her* then?" G. Eliot, *Mill*, i., 80, "there's nothing ails *her*".

With *seem* the shifting observable in the case of *like*, etc., has not taken place, although there were formerly tendencies in this direction; Kellner[1] gives two instances from old wills of the personal use (with the person to whom it seems, in the nom.), and in Somersetshire[2] *I zim* now means "it seems to me" exactly as the Danish *jeg synes*.[3] The following examples of a corresponding use I give with some diffidence:—

> Malory, 76, "So whan the kynge was come thyder with all his baronage and lodged as *they semed* best"; comp., on the other hand, *ibid.*, 77, "*me semeth*" | Spalding, *Eng. Lit.*, 358, "*we seem* often as if we were listening to an observant speaker".

**78.** (180) I must here mention the history of some peculiar phrases. When the universal tendency to use impersonal expressions personally seized upon the idiom *me were liever* (or *me were as lief*), the

[1] *L. c.*, p. 1. Kellner does not seem to be right in asserting that the O. E. verb means "think, believe".

[2] Elworthy, *Word-book* (E.D.S.), p. 851.

Danish offers a great many parallels to the English development of personal constructions out of impersonal.

resulting personal construction came in contact with the synonymous phrase *I had liever* (or *I had as lief*),[1] and a considerable amount of confusion arose in this as well as in the kindred combinations with *as good, better, best, rather.* I give some instances of the various constructions found, starring those in which the case employed seems to run counter to logic:—

*Oros.*, 220, 26, "*him leofre wæs* þæt . . ." | *Ancr. R.*, 230, "*ham was leoure* uorte adrenchen ham sulf þen uorte beren ham " | *ibid.*, 242, "asken þe hwat *te were leouest*" | Sirith, 382, "*Me were levere* then ani fe That he hevede enes leien bi me" | Chauc., *B.*, 1027, "*she hadde* [var. l. **Hire hadde*] lever a knyf Thurghout hir brest, than ben a womman wikke" | *ibid.*, *C.*, 760, "if that *yow be so leef* To fynde deeth" [two MSS. **ye be*, others *to you be*] | *ibid.*, *E.*, 444, "al *had* **hir leuer* haue born a knaue child" | Malory, 87, "*he had leuer* kyng Lotte had been slayne than kynge Arthur" | *ibid.*, 92, "*I had leuer* mete with that knyght" | Sh., *Cor.*, iv., 5, 186, "*I had as liue* be a condemn'd man".

Chauc., *M. P.*, 5, 511, "*him were as good* be stille" | *ibid.*, 5, 571, "yet *were it bet for the* Have hold thy pees" | Bale, *Three L.*, 889, "**Thu were moch better* to kepe thy pacience" | Udall, *Roister*, 46, "**ye were best* sir for a while to reuiue againe" |

[1] He is dear to me = I have (hold) him dear.

Marlowe, *Jew*, 1798, "**he were best* to send it" (cf. *ibid.*, 869, 1851, 1908) | Sh., *Meas.*, iii., 2, 38, "**he were as good* go a mile" | *ibid.*, *As*, iii., 3, 92, "**I were better* to bee married" | *ibid.*, *R. III.*, iv., 4, 337, "What *were* **I best* to say?" | *ibid.*, *Shrew*, v., 1, 108, "Then **thou wert best* saie that I am not Lucentio" | *ibid.*, *Cymb.*, iii., 6, 19, "**I were best* not call" | Milton, *S. A.*, 1061, "But *had we best* retire?" | Field., *T. Jones*, ii., 110, "Your La'ship *had* almost *as good* be alone" | Thack., *Pend.*, iii., 131, "*you had much best* not talk to him".

Marlowe, *Jew*, 147, "*Rather had I* a Jew be hated thus, Then pittied" | Sh., *R. II.*, iii., 3, 192, "**Me rather had*, my heart might feele your loue".[1]

[1] Those who object to the form *had* in "*I had rather speak than be silent*," etc. (see for instance a letter from Robert Browning in Mrs. Orr's *Handbook*, 6th ed., p. 14), seem wrongly to take *rather* as an adverb instead of an adjective; it is incorrect to urge that the omission of the adverb would "alter into nonsense the verb it qualifies," for *had rather* is to be taken as a whole, governing the following infinitive. *Had rather* is used by the best authors, by Shakespeare at least some sixty times, while *would rather* is comparatively rare in his writings and generally confined to such cases as *Two Gent.*, v., 4, 34, "I *would* haue beene a breakfast to the Beast, *Rather* then have false Protheus reskue me," where, of course, *rather* belongs only indirectly to *would*. In an interesting paper, "Had Rather and Analogous Phrases," in the Dutch periodical *Taalstudie* (viii., 216), C. Stoffel shows that so far from

**79.** (181) I must here also mention the peculiarity of the English language by which not only what would be the direct object of the active verb but other parts of the sentence may be made the *subject of a passive verb*. As I have not collected sufficient materials to give an exhaustive treatment of this interesting subject, I shall confine myself to a few remarks. There can be little doubt that nouns were employed

*had rather* being an "incorrect graphic expansion" of *I'd rather* instead of *I would rather*, the *had* form historically is the better of the two. Stoffel is undoubtedly right in his conclusions; still it is interesting to notice how the feeling of the etymological connexion has been lost on account of the phonetic identity of the unstressed forms of *had* and *would* [əd]; the change in the popular instinct is already seen in Shakespeare's *Rich. III.* (iii., 7, 161), where the folio emends the *had rather* of the old quartos into *would rather*. A further step in the gradual forgetting of the old idiom is shown by the occasional introduction of *should*, as in Conan Doyle, *Adv. of Sherlock Holmes*, i. 228, "Or should you rather that I sent James off to bed?" Nor are signs wanting that in other cases as well as before *rather* the feeling of the difference between *had* and *would* has become obscured; I shall give two quotations, one from Tennyson's *Becket* (act iii., sc. 3), "You *had* safelier have slain an archbishop than a she-goat," and the other from a little Cockney, who writes, "If anybody else *had* have told me that, I wouldn't have beleeved it" (see *Original English, as Written by our Little Ones at School*, by H. J. Baker, Lond., 1889). A. Trollope writes (*Old Man's Love*, 263), "Had you remained here, and have taken me, I should certainly not have failed then," where, by a singular confusion, *had* seems first to have its proper meaning, and then to be taken as an equivalent of [əd] = *would*.

in this way as "free subjects" of passive verbs at an earlier time than pronouns in which the nom. and the acc. had distinct forms. I shall arrange my examples under four heads.[1]

(1) The verb originally governs the dative case, but has no direct object in the accusative. Such an instance as (*Ancren Riwle*, 82) *God beo iðoncked* is not quite beyond question, as the form *God* is used in that text in the dative as well as in the nominative; but the following is indubitable, as *Louerd* is not used as a dative :—[2]

*Ancr. R.*, 8, "vre Louerd beo iðoncked" | Chaucer, *L. G. W.*, 1984, "He shall be holpen" | *ibid.*, *Morr.*, iii., 11 (compare Einenkel, 111), "I may be holpe" | Malory, 125, "he myght neuer be holpen" | *ibid.*, 36, "youre herte shalbe pleasyd" | *ibid.*, 463, "he was answerd".[3]

(2) The verb is combined with a preposition; then the word governed by the latter is considered as the object of the composite expression (verb and prep.), and can therefore be made the subject of a passive proposition.

Maundev., 22 (quoted by Koch), "Thei ben sent

[1] Cf. Koch, *Gram.*, ii., § 147 ff.

[2] The dative is *louerde;* see pp. 160, 168, also p. 58, where the MS. has *louerde* according to Kölbing, and not *louerd* as Morton prints it.

[3] This is given by Kellner (*Blanchard.*, lv.) as the only instance found in Malory.

fore" | Malory, 35, "we were sent for"; similarly, though with a noun as the subject *ibid.*, 47, twice, p. 67, p. 38, "lete hym be sent for" | Latimer, *Spec.*, iii., 21, 46, "they wyl not be yl spoken of" | *ibid.*, 251, "that whiche I can not leaue vnspoken of" | Sh., 1 *H. IV.*, iii., 2, 141, "your vnthought-of Harry" | *ibid.*, i., 2, 225, "Being wanted, he may be more wondred at" (see *ibid.*, i., 3, 154; iii., 2, 47; *R. II.*, i., 3, 155, etc.) | Meredith, *Trag. Com.*, 76, "The desire of her bosom was to be run away with in person".

Compare the somewhat analogous phenomenon in *Ancr. R.*, 6, "sum is old & atelich & is ðe leasse dred of" (*is dred of* is a sort of passive of *habben dred of*); here, however, we have rather a continuation of the old use of *of* as an adverb = "thereof".

(3) The verb governs both an accusative and a dative; in this case there is a growing tendency to make the dative the subject when the verb is made passive. The oldest examples are:—

*Ancr. R.*, 112, "he was þus ileten blod" | *ibid.*, 260, "swinkinde men & blod-letene" | *ibid.*, 258, "heo beoð ileten blod"; similarly, 262 (he), 422 (ge, twice).

It should, however, be remarked that *let blood*, more than most of these combinations, is felt as *one* notion, as is seen also by the participle being used attributively (p. 260) and by the verbal noun *blod-*

*lettunge* (14, 114). Something approaching the indirect passive construction is found in the following passage:—

*Ancr. R.*, 180, "ȝif *me*[1] *is* iluued more þen anoðer, & more ioluhned, more *idon god, oðer menske*,"

from which it would perhaps be rash to conclude that the author would have said, for instance, "*he is idon god oðer menske*," if these expressions had not been preceded by the direct passives *iluued* (loved) and *ioluhned* (caressed). At any rate these constructions do not become frequent till much later; in Chaucer I have found only one instance (*L. G. W.*, 292, "And some were brend, and *some wer cut the hals*"); Mätzner quotes one from the *Towneley Mysteries* ("alle my shepe are gone; *I am not left one*"); Kellner knows none in the whole of Caxton,[2] which may be explained by the fact that Caxton's translations closely follow the original French in most syntactical respects. For examples from Shakespeare and recent authors I may refer to Koch, ii., § 153, and Mätzner, ii., p. 229. The following passage shows the vacillation found to a great extent even in our own century:—

Sh., *Macb.*, i., 5, 14-17 (305-308), "ignorant

[1] *Me* is the indefinite pronoun (*men, man*), corresponding to French *on*.

[2] The dative is used for instance in Malory, 89, "there was told *hym* the adventure of the swerd" | "therefore was gyuen *hym* the pryse".

of what greatnesse *is promis'd thee* (in Macbeth's letter) . . . Glamys thou art, and Cawdor, and shalt be what *thou art promis'd*" (comp. *Wint. T.*, iv., 4, 237, "I was promis'd them").

To this category belongs also such a phrase as the following:—

Shak., *As*, i., 1, 128, "*I am giuen* sir secretly to vnderstand that your younger brother . . .".

(4) The verb beside a direct object has attached to it a preposition and a word governed properly by the preposition, but coming to be taken as the object of the composite expression, verb + object + preposition:—

"I was *taken no notice of*" | Carlyle, *Sartor*, 29, "new means must of necessity be *had recourse to*".

Here, too, I am able to point out a sentence in the *Ancren Riwle* containing, so to speak, a first germ of the construction:—

*Ancr. R.*, 362, "Nes Seinte Peter & Seinte Andreu istreiht o rode . . . and *loðlease meidenes þe tittes ikoruen of*, and to-hwiðered o hweoles, & hefdes bikoruen?"

**80.** (182) This extension of the passive construction is no doubt in the first place due to the effacement of the formal distinction between the dative and the accusative; but a second reason seems to be the same fact which we met with before in the case of verbs originally impersonal: the greater interest felt for the

person makes the speaker place the noun or pronoun by which the person is indicated before the direct object, as in the sentence: "He gave the girl a gold watch". This makes it natural that in the passive voice the dative should be placed at the very beginning of the sentence: "The girl was given a gold watch". But this position immediately before the verb is generally reserved for the subject; so *the girl*, though originally a dative, comes to be looked upon as a nominative, and instead of "*her* was given a gold watch," we say, "*she* was given a gold watch". On the other hand, the nature of these constructions reacts on the feeling for case-distinctions in general; for when "I was taught grammar at school" comes to mean the same thing as "me was taught grammar," or "she was told" as "her was told," etc., there is one inducement the more to use the two cases indiscriminately in other sentences as well, or at least to distinguish them in a different way from that which prevailed in the old language.

**81.** (183) No doubt the position before the verb has also been instrumental in changing the old *absolute dative* (as seen, for instance, in *Chron.*, 797, "*Gode fultomiendum*, God helping") into the modern nominative.

A few instances will show that the modern construction was fully established in Shakespeare's time :— [1]

[1] See also Mätzner, iii., 75 ff.; Koch, ii., 130 ff. I have not had access to Ross's dissertation, *The Absolute Participle in Middle and Modern English* (Johns Hopkins Univ., 1893).

Sh., *Venus*, 1019, "For *he* being dead, with him is beauty slain" | *ibid.*, *Cymb.*, ii., 4, 8, "*they* [the hopes] fayling, I must die" | *ibid.*, iii., 5, 64, "*Shee* being downe, I haue the placing of the British crowne" | *ibid.*, *Temp.*, v., 1, 28, "*they* being penitent, the sole drift of my purport doth extend Not a frowne further" | *ibid.*, *Cor.*, v., 4, 37, "and *he* returning to breake our necks, they respect not vs" | *ibid.*, *R. III.*, iv., 2, 104, "How chance the prophet could not at that time Haue told me, *I* being by, that I should kill him" | *ibid.*, *Errors*, iii., 2, 87, "not that *I* beeing a beast she would haue me".

Gill, in his *Logonomia*, 1619, p. 69, mentions the modern construction only, showing thereby that the old one was completely forgotten at that time, even by learned men :—

"Nominatiuus absolutus apud Anglos ita vsurpatur, vti apud Latinos Ablatiuus: vt I bïing prëzent, hï durst not have dun it. . . . Hï bïing in trubl, hiz frindz forsük him."

We are, therefore, astonished to find Milton using the old dative towards the end of that century :—

*P. L.*, ix., 130, "and *him* destroyed . . . all this will soon follow" | *ibid.*, vii., 142, "by whose aid This inaccessible high strength, the seat of Deity supreme, *us* dispossessed, He trusted to have seized" | *Sams.*, 463, "Dagon hath presum'd, *Me* overthrown, to enter lists with God".

But this peculiar use of Milton's is undoubtedly due rather to an imitation of Latin syntax than to a survival of the Old English construction, and Milton in other places employs the nominative:—

*P. L.*, ix., 312, "while shame, *thou* looking on . . . Would utmost vigour raise" | *ibid.*, ix., 884, "Lest, *thou* not tasting, different degree Disjoin us".

I have already mentioned that the phenomenon I termed "unconnected subject" may have contributed something towards the growth of the absolute nominative, see § 63; I shall here call attention to another circumstance that may have favoured this construction, namely, that in such sentences as the following an apposition (in the nominative) is practically not to be distinguished from the absolute construction:—

Field., *Tom Jones*, ii., 42, "The lovers stood both silent and trembling, *Sophia being* unable to withdraw her hand from Jones, and *he* almost as unable to hold it" | C. Doyle, *Sherl. Holmes*, i., 36, "they separated, *he driving* back to the Temple, and *she* to own house".

It is true that these sentences are modern and penned long after the absolute nom. had been settled; but although I have no old quotations ready to hand, similar expressions may and must have occurred at any time.

**82.** (184) Having dealt (in §§ 68-81) with the substitution of the nominative for an original accusa-

tive or dative before the verb, we shall now proceed to the corresponding tendency to use an objective case *after the verb* where a nominative would be used in the old language. This is, of course, due to the preponderance of the instances in which the word immediately following the verb is its object.[1] The most important outcome of this tendency is the use of *me* after *it is*. I have already had occasion to mention a few connexions in which the accusative will naturally come to be used after *it is* (see §§ 52 and 55); to these might be added accusatives with the infinitive, as in Greene, *Friar Bacon*, 10, 57, "*Let it be me*". But even where there is no inducement of that kind to use *me*, this form will occur after *it is* by the same linguistic process that has led in Danish to the exclusive use of *det er mig*, where some centuries ago the regular expression would have been *det er jeg*, and which is seen also in the French *c'est*, used in Old French with the oblique form of nouns and then also of pronouns, *c'est moi*, etc.[2]

With regard to the English development from O. E., *ic hit eom*, through the Chaucerian *it am I* (*Cant.*, *B.*, 1109, *M. P.*, 3, 186, etc.) to *it is I*[3] and *it is me*, I shall refer to a letter from A. J. Ellis, printed in

[1] When Trollope writes (*Duke's Ch.*, ii., 227), "There might be somebody, though I think not *her*," *her* is viewed as a sort of object of "I think".

[2] On the French development see, for instance, Lidforss in *Öfversikt af Filologiska sälskapets i Lund Förhandlinger*, 1881-88 p. 15.

[3] Malory, 36, "I am he".

Alford's *The Queen's English*, p. 115, and to Storm, *Engl. Philol.*, 1881, pp. 209-10, 234 ff.; the latter author gives a great many modern examples of the accusative in familiar speech. Ellis goes so far as to say that "the phrase *it is I* is a modernism, or rather a grammaticism, that is, it was never in popular use, but was introduced solely on some grammatical hypothesis as to having the same case before and after the verb *is*. . . . The conclusion seems to be that *it's me* is good English, and *it's I* is a mistaken purism." The eminent author of *Early English Pronunciation* is no doubt right in defending *it's me* as the natural form against the blames of quasi-grammarians: but I am not so sure that he is right when he thinks that *it is I* is due only to the theories of schoolmasters, and that "it does not appear to have been consonant with the feelings of Teutonic tribes to use the nominative of the personal pronouns as a predicate". He seems to have overlooked that it was formerly used so often with the nom. that we cannot ascribe the usage exclusively to the rules of theorists; see, for instance :—

Chaucer, *B.*, 1054, "it was *she*" | Malory, 38, "it was *I* myself that cam" | *Roister Doister*, 21, "that shall not be *I*" | *ibid.*, 58, "it was *I* that did offende" | *ibid.*, 26, "this is not *she*" | Marlowe, *Jew*, 656, "'tis *I*" | Shak., *Macb.*, 877, 1009, 1014 (and at other places), "it was *he*," or "'tis *hee*".

**83.** (185) The nom. accordingly seems to have been the natural idiom, just as *det er jeg* was in

Danish a few centuries ago, and as *det är jag* is still in Sweden; but now it is otherwise, and *it is me* must be reckoned good English, just as *det er mig* is good Danish. In Shakespeare (besides the passages accounted for above) we find the accusative used in three passages, and it is well worth noting that two of them are pronounced by vulgar people, *viz.*, *Two Gent.*, ii., 3, 25, "the dogge is *me*" (the clown Launce), and *Lear*, i., 4, 204, "I would not be *thee*" (the fool; comp. *Pericl.*, ii., 1, 68, "here's *them* in our country of Greece gets more," spoken by the fisherman); the third time it is the angry Timon who says: "[I am proud] that I am not *thee*" (iv., 3, 277). The stamp of vulgarity would have disappeared completely by now from the expression had it not been for grammar schools and school grammars; even to the most refined speakers *it's me* is certainly more natural than *it's I*.[1] And Shelley has consecrated the construction as serviceable in the highest poetic style by writing in his *Ode to the West Wind:* "Be thou, spirit fierce, my spirit! *Be thou me*, impetuous one!"

Latham, Ellis, Sweet and Alford defend *it is me* as the only natural expression; the reason of their not extending this recognition of the objective case equally to the other persons will be found below

[1] Trollope makes a young lord say: "I wish it were me" (*Duke's Childr.*, iii., 118); comp. *ibid.*, ii., 64, "It is you. . . . '*Me!*' said Miss Boncassen, choosing to be ungrammatical in order that he might be more absurd." Many other examples in Storm.

(§ 92); yet in Thackeray's *Vanity Fair*, p. 163, a young lady says *It's her;* and in *Cambridge Trifles*, p. 96, an undergraduate says *It couldn't be them*—to mention only two examples.

**84.** (186) Not only the predicate but also the subject itself is liable to be put in the accusative after the verb. *Shall's* (= *shall us*) for *shall we* is found six times in Shakespeare. As four times it means exactly or nearly the same thing as *let us* (*Cor.*, iv., 6, 148, "Shal's to the Capitoll"; *Wint.*, i., 2, 178; *Cymb.*, v., 5, 228; *Pericl.*, iv., 5, 7), it is probable that this idiom is originally due to a blending of *let us* and *shall we* (compare the corresponding use of a nom. after let, § 54). But it has been extended to other cases as well: *Tim.*, iv., 3, 408, "How shal's get it?" | *Cymb.*, iv., 2, 233, "Where shall's lay him?" Towards the end of the last century *shall us* was common in vulgar speech according to Sam. Pegge,[1] who adds:

[1] See his *Anecdotes of the Engl. Language* (1803; re-edited 1814 and 1844, with additions by the editors; Pegge himself died in 1800). This is a very remarkable work, excellent alike for the power of observation it displays and for the author's explanations of linguistic phenomena, by which he is often many years ahead of his time, and often reminds one of that eminent philologist who was to take up the rational study of vulgar English about eighty years later: Johan Storm. Of course, it is no disparagement to Pegge to remark that many of the phenomena he deals with are now explained otherwise than was possible to him, before the birth of comparative philology. I shall here quote an interesting remark of his: "Before I undertook this investigation, I was not aware that *we all speak so incorrectly* in our daily colloquial language as we do". This

"The Londoner also will say—"Can us," "May us," and "Have us". Storm quotes (p. 209) from Dickens some instances of vulgar *shall us, can't us, do us, hadn't us;* is this phenomenon still living in the mouth of uneducated people? I do not call to mind a single instance from the Cockney literature of the last ten years or so.

**85.** (187) I find a further trace of the influence of position in Shakespeare, *Macb.*, 2044 (v., 8, 34), "And *damn'd be him*[1] that first cries hold, enough!" *Damn'd be* is here taken as one whole meaning the same thing as, and therefore governing the same case as, *damn* or *God damn.* The person that should properly be the subject of the verb is sometimes even governed by a *to*:—

Field., *T. Jones*, i., 297, "Are not you ashamed, and *be d—n'd to you*, to fall two of you upon one?" | *ibid.*, ii., 118, "*be d—ned to you*" | *ibid.*, iv., 87, "You my son-in-law, and *be d—n'd to you!*" | Thack., *Van. F.*, 158, "*be hanged to them*"; similarly, *ibid.*, 274, 450; *Pendennis*, ii., 146, 314, 317[2] | Darwin, *Life and Lett.*, iii., 76, "I went to

will no doubt express the sentiment of every serious student of any living language; but does it not suggest a doubt as to the truth of most current ideas of what constitutes correctness in language?

[1] Of course, Pope and most later editors "emend" *him* into *he.*

[2] *Pendennis*, ii., 321, "Field of honour be hanged!"

Lubbock's, partly in hopes of seeing you, and, *be hanged to you*, you were not there" | Mrs. Ward, *D. Grieve*, i, 220, "*be d—d* to your Christian brotherhood!"

Here the phrase *be damned*, or its substitute *be hanged*, has become an exclamation, and *to you* is added as if "I say" was understood; compare also *Hail to thee* (Middle Engl. *heil be þow*); *farewell to you*; *welcome to you*; *good-bye to you*.[1]

An earlier form of the phrase *Would to God* is *Would God*, where *God* is the subject:—

Chaucer, *M. P.*, 3, 814, "God wolde I coude clepe her wers" | Malory, 66, "so wold god I had another" [hors] | *ibid.*, 81, "wolde god she had not comen in to thys courte" | Greene, *Friar B.*, 6, 40, "would God the lovely earl had that".

But when people lost the habit of placing a subject after the verb, they came to take *would* as an equivalent of *I would* and *God* as a dative; and the analogy of the corresponding phrase *I wish to God* (or, I pray to God) would of course facilitate the change of *God* into *to God*.

**86.** (188) The position after the verb has probably had no small share in rendering the use of *thee* (and *you*) so frequent *after an imperative*, especially in the

[1] *Hamlet*, ii., 2, 575, qu.; this phrase properly contains two *you*s; compare also Stevenson, *Tr. Isl.*, 256, "I've got my piece o' news, and *thanky to him* for that" (*thanky* = thank ye, thank you).

first Modern English period ; the usage is still seen in the poetical phrase "*Fare thee well*". Here we have, however, a concurrent influence in the use of a reflexive pronoun (without the addition of *self*) which was extremely common in all the early periods of the language, and which did not perceptibly alter the meaning of the verb to which it was added.[1] This reflexive pronoun was sometimes originally added in the accusative case, *e.g.*, after *restan* (see Voges, p. 333), but generally in the dative; this distinction, however, had obviously no significance for any but the very earliest stages of the language. As now it made no difference whatever whether the speaker said *I fear* or *I fear me* (compare, for instance, Marlowe, *Jew*, 876, with 1110), the imperative would be indifferently *fear* or *fear thee* (*fear yow*);[2] but it was equally possible with the same meaning to say *fear thou* (*fear ye*), with the usual addition of the nominative of the pronoun to indicate the subject. Examples from Malory of the latter combination : 73, "go ye" | 74, "telle thow" | 75, "doubte ye not," etc. etc.[3] In other words : *after an imperative a nominative and an accusative would*

[1] See Voges, *Der reflexive dativ im Englischen*, in *Anglia*, vi., 1883, p. 317, ff. To supplement my own collections, I take the liberty of using those of his numerous quotations which seem best suited to illustrate the process of case-shifting, a subject which Voges deals with only in a cursory manner.

[2] Chaucer, *L. G. W.*, 1742, "dreed thee noght" | Malory 61 and 85, "drede yow not".

[3] Sometimes both cases are used in the same sentence: "Slep *thou the* anon" (Judas, quoted by Voges, 336).

*very often be used indiscriminately.* Thus, *Care ye not* (Malory, 72) means exactly the same thing as *care not yow* (*ibid.*, 135); *stay thou* (Sh., *Cæs.*, v., 5, 44) = *stay thee* (3 *H. VI.*, iii., 2, 58); *get ye gon* (Marlowe, *Jew*, 1226) = *get you gone* (common, Sh.); *stand thou forth* (Sh., *All*, v., 3, 35) = *stand thee by* (*Ado*, iv., 1, 24); *turn ye* unto him (Isaiah, xxxvi., 6; Ezek., xxxiii., 11) = *turn you*, at my reproof (Prov., i., 23); *turn you* to the stronghold, *ye* prisoners of hope (Zech., ix., 12); *turn thee* unto me (Ps., xxv., 16) = *turn thou* unto me (*ibid.*, lxix., 16[1]); *fare ye well* (Sh., *Merch.*, i., 1, 58 and 103) = *fare you well* (*ibid.*, ii., 7, 73); seldom as in *Tim.*, i., 1, 164, *Well fare you, fare thou well* (*Temp.*, v., 318) = *fartheewell* (*Tw. N.*, iii., 4, 183); *far-thee-well* (*ibid.*, iii., 4, 236); *far thee well* (*ibid.*, iv., 2, 61); *sit thou* by my bedde (Sh., 2 *H. IV.*, iv., 5, 182) = *sit thee* downe vpon this flowry bed (*Mids. N.*, iv., 1, 1; also with the transitive verb *set thee down*, *Love's L.*, iv., 3, 4, in some editions emended into *sit*!).

**87.** (189) It will now be easily understood that *thee* (or *you*) would be frequently added to imperatives where the thought of a reflexive pronoun would not be very appropriate; in *hear thee*, *hark thee*, *look thee* and similar cases, Voges finds a reflexive dative,

[1] The quotations from the Bible are taken from Washington Moon's *Ecclesiastical English*, p. 170; this author blames the translators for their inconsistency and for their bad grammar; he does not know that Shakespeare is guilty of the very same "faults," and he does not suspect the historical reason of the phenomenon.

whereas Al. Schmidt quotes them under the heading "*thee* for *thou*"; it is rather difficult to draw a line here. When Troilus says (act iv., 5, 115): "Hector, thou sleep'st, *awake thee*," no less than three grammatical explanations are applicable: *awake* may be intransitive, and *thee* the subject (Al. Schmidt), *awake* is intransitive, but *thee* is a reflexive dative (Voges, *l. c.*, p. 372), and finally, *awake* may be a transitive verb having *thee* as its object (comp. Murray's Dict.); but whichever way the grammatical construction is explained, the meaning remains the same.[1]

It is evident that all this must have contributed very much to impair the feeling of the case-distinction, and it should be remarked that we have here a *cause of confusion that is peculiar to the pronouns of the second person*.[2]

[1] We may perhaps be allowed to conclude from the following passage that *you* after an imperative was at the time of Shakespeare felt as an accusative: *As*, i., 3, 45, "Mistris, dispatch you with your safest haste, And get you from our court. *Me* Vncle?"

[2] When in Living English a pronoun is added to an imperative, it is generally placed before it: "*You* try! *You* take that chair!" | "Never *you* mind!" | C. Doyle, *Sherl. H.*, i., 63, "And now, Mr. Wilson, off *you* go at scratch" | Jerome, *Three Men in a Boat*, 30, "Now, *you* get a bit of paper and write down, J., and *you* get the grocery catalogue, George, and *somebody* give me a bit of pencil". When the auxiliary *do* is used, the pronoun comes before the principal verb: "*Don't you* stir!" | C. Doyle, *l. c.*, 94, "I shall stand behind the crate, and *do you* conceal yourselves behind those" | *ibid.*, ii., 71, "*Don't you* dare to meddle with my affairs". Compare from

**88.** (190) In connexion with the reflexive expressions mentioned just now I shall remind the reader that we have a still more radical change in the case of the *reflexive pronoun when joined to self. Him self* was originally added to the verb with the meaning of a dative, "to, or for, himself"; but it came to be regarded as an emphatic apposition to the subject (he has done it *himself;* he *himself* has done it), and finally it is sometimes used as a subject by itself (*himself* has done it). We see the first beginnings of this development in Old English phrases like these :—

*Oros.*, 194, 21, "þa angeat Hannibal, & *him self* sæde"[1] | *ibid.*, 260, 33, "[Nero] gestod *him self* on þæm hiehstan torre" | *Ancr. R.*, 226, "ȝe beoð tures *ou sulf*, 'ye yourselves are towers'" | *ibid.*, 258, "*he him sulf* hit seið".

It would be a waste of paper and ink to give examples from more recent times, as they abound everywhere; I shall therefore only state the fact that in the modern use of *himself* and *themselves* (and

last century Fielding, *T. Jones*, iv., 131, "Well then," said Jones, "*do you* leave me at present" | *ibid.*, 157, "*Do you* be a good girl" | *ibid.*, 302, "Harkee, sir, *do you* find out the letter which your mother sent me". It will be seen that in this deviation from the position rules of former times we have an application of the rule laid down in § 68.

[1] For this can hardly mean at this place: "he said to himself"; the Latin original has: "Tunc Annibal dixisse fertur".

*herself?*) we have a dative used as a nominative (or rather as a common case), and that this was formerly the case with *me self* and *us self* (or *us selue*, *seluen*) as well, which have now been ousted by *myself* and *ourselves*.[1]

**89.** (191) Sometimes we come across isolated uses of the objective for the nominative case, which are probably to be ascribed to analogical influence exercised by the *self*-combinations. Abbott quotes (§ 214) :—

Sh., *John*, iv., 2, 50, "Your safety, for the which
my selfe and *them* Bend their best studies";

and says: "Perhaps *them* is attracted by myself," which naturally suggests the objective "myself and (they) them (selves)". That this is the correct explanation seems to be rendered more likely by the parallel passage :—

Marl., *Tamb.*, 433, "Thy selfe and *them* shall
neuer part from me,"

and perhaps it is also applicable to these two sentences :—

Sh., *Wint.*, i., 2, 410, "Or both your selfe and *me*

[1] It is with some hesitation that I place this use of *him* (*self*) in the section headed "Position," as it neither is nor ever was obligatory to place *himself* after the verb. As this position is, however, the most common, it may have had some influence in determining the form *himself* in preference to *he self*, which was used in O.E., and at any rate the arrangement followed in this section has the advantage of not sundering the two classes of reflexive datives.

Cry lost" | *Cæs.*, i., 3, 76, "No mightier then thy selfe, or *me*" [N.B., than!].

**90.** (192) In his book *The King's English*, p. viii., Mr. Washington Moon writes:—

"As a specimen of real 'Queen's English,' take the following, which was found written in the second Queen Mary's Bible: 'This book was given the king and *I* at our coronation'".

How is this *I* to be explained? Of course it might be referred to the passive constructions treated above, § 79, though then we should have expected *were* instead of *was* and a different word-order ("The king and I were given this book," or perhaps, "This book the king and I were given"). But I believe that another explanation is possible: *I* was preferred to *me* after *and*, because the group of words *you and I*, *he and I*, etc., in which this particular word-order was required by common politeness, would occur in every-day speech so frequently as to make it practically a sort of stock phrase taken as a whole, the last word of which was therefore not inflected. At all events, it cannot fail to strike one in reading Storm's instances of nominative instead of objective case (*Engl. Philol.*, p. 210 f.) that the great majority of sentences in which *I* stands for *me* present these combinations (seventeen from Shakespeare,[1] Ben Jonson, Bunyan, Dickens, etc., against two, which are moreover hardly genuine). Abbott says: "'*Tween you and I* seems to

[1] Some of these, it is true, may be explained on the principle mentioned in § 54.

have been a regular Elizabethan idiom". It is found for instance in *Merch.*, iii., 2, 321, and is not yet extinct. I subjoin a few examples to supplement those given by Storm :—

(*Tom Brown*, 3, see § 54) | Goldsmith, *Mist. of a Night*, i., "Won't you give *papa and I* a little of your company?" | S. Pegge, *Anecd.*, 307, "To *you and I*, Sir, who have seen half a hundred years, it is refunding".

It will be seen that, if my explanation is the correct one, we have here an influence of word-position of quite a different order from that pointed out in the rest of this section. Dr. Sweet,[1] while accepting this explanation as far as the Elizabethan idiom is concerned, thinks that when *between you and I* or *he saw John and I* is said now-a-days, it is due to the grammatical reaction against the vulgar use of *me* for *I*.

## VI. Phonetic Influences.

**91.** (193) I now come to the last but by no means the least important of the agencies that have brought about changes in the original relations between the cases of the pronouns. I mean the influence of sound upon sense.

If you glance at the list of pronominal forms printed in § 50 you will see that six of them rhyme together, the nominatives *we*, *ye*, *he*, *she*, and the accusatives *me*, *thee*. After the old case-rules had been shaken in different ways, instinctive feeling

[1] See *New Engl. Grammar*, p. 340 f.

seized upon this similarity, and likeness in form has partly led to likeness in function.

As evidence of this tendency I shall first mention Malory's use of the impersonal verbs that in his times were ceasing to have an impersonal and adopting a personal construction (§ 71 ff.). Malory has a manifest predilection for the *e*-forms with these verbs without any regard to their original case-values. I note all the instances found in some hundred pages :—

Malory, 115, "now *me* lacketh an hors" | 127, "*ye* shalle lacke none" | | 71,90,148, "*me* lyst(e)" | 61, 114, 146, "*ye* lyst" | | 76, "*ye* nede not to pulle half so hard" | 115, "*ye* shalle not nede" | | 153, "*he* shalle repente . . . *me* sore repenteth" | 59, 82, 83, 84, 96, 106, 107, 117, 133, "*me* repenteth" | 78,80, "*ye* shalle repente hit" | 117, "*ye* ou3t sore to repente it" | 79, 82, 118, "*me* forthynketh" (="I repent") | | 121, "it were *me* leuer" | 46, "*ye* were better for to stynte" | 62, "*ye* were better to gyue" | 87, "whether is *me* better to treate" | 69, "that is *me* loth" | 90, "that were *me* loth to doo" | 100, "*he* wylle be lothe to returne" | 105, "*we* wolde be loth to haue adoo with yow" | 115, "*he* is ful loth to do wronge".

The following are the only exceptions :—

131, "though *I* lacke wepen, *I* shalle lacke no worship" | 101, "*hym* nedeth none" | 82, "els wold *I* haue ben lothe" | 112, 131, "*I* am loth".[1]

[1] *Thynke* and *lyke* are always impersonal in Malory; cf. above, § 74.

A century later the same holds good with the verb *lust* in *Roister Doister: ye* (pp. 12 and 51), *me* (12), *he* (42), *she* (87); there are two exceptions: *hym* (43), *I* (44).

The phonetic similarity is used to mark the contrast in Sh., *Macb.*, iii., 4, 14 (1035), "'Tis better thee without then he within"; see W. A. Wright's note: "It [Banquo's blood] is better outside thee than inside him. In spite of the defective grammar, this must be the meaning."

**92.** (194) We now see the reason why *me* is very often used as a nominative even by educated speakers, who in the same positions would never think of using *him* or *her*. Thus after *it is*, see above, § 83, and compare the following utterances:—

LATHAM (see Alford, p. 115): "the present writer . . . finds nothing worse in it [*it is me*] than a Frenchman finds in *c'est moi*. . . . At the same time it must be observed that the expression *it is me* = *it is I*, will not justify the use of *it is him*, *it is her* = *it is he*, and *it is she*. *Me*, *ye*, *you* are what may be called *indifferent forms*, *i.e.*, nominative as much as accusative, and accusative as much as nominative."

ELLIS (*ibid.*): "*it's me* is good English".

ALFORD: "'It is me' . . . is an expression which every one uses. Grammarians (of the smaller order) protest: schoolmasters (of the lower kind) prohibit and chastise;

but English men, women and children go on saying it."

SWEET (*Words, Log. and Gr.*, 26): "it is only the influence of ignorant grammarians that prevents such phrases as 'it is me' from being adopted into the written language, and acknowledged in the grammars. . . . The real difference between 'I' and 'me' is that 'I' is an inseparable prefix used to form finite verbs [also a 'suffix': am I, etc.], while 'me' is an independent or absolute pronoun, which can be used without a verb to follow. These distinctions are carried out in vulgar English as strictly as in French, where the distinction between the conjoint 'je' and the absolute 'moi' is rigidly enforced."

SWEET (*Primer of Spoken Engl.*, 36): "The nom. *I* is only used in immediate agreement with a verb; when used absolutely, *me* is substituted for it by the formal analogy of *he, we, she*, which are used absolutely as well as dependently: *it's he, it's me; who's there? me*".

**93.** (195) I shall give here a few quotations to show the parallelism of *me* and *he* as unconnected subjects (see § 62):—

Thack., *Pend.*, ii., 325, "Why the devil are you to be rolling in riches, and *me* to have none? Why should you have a house and

a table covered with plate, and *me* be in a garret?" | Black, *Princess of Thule*, ii., 89, "What do you think of a man who would give up his best gun to you, even though you couldn't shoot a bit, and *he* particularly proud of his shooting?" | *ibid.*, ii., 141, "I am not going to be talked out of my common-sense, and *me* on my death-bed!"[1]

The common answer which was formerly always *Not I!* (thus in Shakespeare, see Al. Schmidt, *Sh. Lex.*, p. 565 a, bottom of the page) is now often heard as *Not me!* while the corresponding form in the third person does not seem to be *Not him!* even in vulgar speech, but always *Not he!* At least, I find in the Cockney Stories, *Thenks awf'lly*, London, 1890, p. 82, "Not 'e!"[2]

[1] Compare Thack., *Pend.*, i., 295, "'*Me* again at Oxbridge, Pen thought, 'after such a humiliation as that!'" Flügel quotes in his Dictionary, Sterne's *Sent. Journ.*, 314: "my pen governs me, not *me* my pen".

[2] To avoid the natural use of *me*, stamped as incorrect in the schools, and the unnatural use of *I* standing alone, English people add a superfluous verb more frequently than other nations in such sentences as: "he is older than *I am*". Mr. G. C. Moore Smith writes to me: "I do not feel convinced that there is a difference between the vulgar (or natural) English, 'It's me—it's him'; 'not me—and not him'. I think the chief reason of *him* being less common is that while *me* is distinctive, in the third person it is generally necessary to mention the name. It seems to me very familiar English, 'Is he goin'? Not *him*.' Of course such usages may differ in different parts of the country."

**94.** (196) *Me* thus to a certain extent has become a common case under the influence of *he*, etc., and we find some traces of a development in the same direction beginning in the case of the other pronouns in *e*, only that it is here the nominative that has been generalised:—

Sh., *Wives*, iii., 2, 26, "There is such a league betweene my goodman and *he*" | *Wint. T.*, ii., 3, 6, "But *shee* I can hooke to me" (compare § 162 f.) | *Oth.*, iv., 2, 3, "You haue seene Cassio and *she* together" | (*Love's L.*, iv., 2, 30, "Those parts that doe fructifie in vs more then *he*" = in him) | Fielding, *T. Jones*, i., 200 (Squire Western), "It will do'n [do him] no harm with *he*" | *ibid.*, ii., 50 (*idem*), "Between your nephew and *she*" | Cowper, *John Gilpin*, "On horseback after *we*" | (? *Art. Ward, his Book*, 95, "I've promist *she* whose name shall be nameless . . .").

P. Greenwood, *Grammatica Anglicana*,[1] mentions among errors committed by plerosque haud mediocri eruditione præditos: "He spake it to *shee* whose fountaines is dried up," and he adds: "Non mirum si vulgus barbarè omnino loquatur, cum qui docti, et sunt, et habentur, tam inscite, et impure scribunt".

**95.** (197) Phonetic influences may have been at

[1] This is the oldest English grammar (printed at Cambridge, 1594); on the title-page are the initials P. G.; I give the author's name from a written note in the unique copy belonging to the British Museum.

work in various other ways. If the vowel of the nominative þu was weakened when the word was unstressed the result would be *þe* [ðə], exactly like a weakened form of the accusative *þe*. This is, I take it, the explanation of the nominative *þe* found so often in the *Ayenbite of Inwit* (A.D. 1340) in such combinations as *þe wylt*, *þe miȝt*, *þe ssoldest*. As *u* is undoubtedly weakened into *e* in *Huannes comste*, "whence comest thou" (*Ayenb.*, 268), as *te* stands certainly for *þu* in Robert of Gloucester, 10792 *seiste*, 3150 *woste*, 4917 *ȝifst' us*,[1] and as similarly *to* is weakened into *te* in the *Ayenbite* as well as in (parts at least of) the *Ancren Riwle*, this phonetic explanation seems to me, as it did to Mätzner,[2] more probable than the two other explanations given by Gummere[3] and Morris.[4]

As, however, this use of *þe* for *þu* is only found in a few texts (also in Sir Beues of Hamtoun, see *Engl. Studien*, xix., 264), we cannot ascribe to it any great influence on the later development.

**96.** (198) Similarly a *you* pronounced with weak

[1] F. Pabst, *Anglia*, xiii., 290.

[2] *Sprachproben*, ii., 76.

[3] *American Journal of Philol.*, iv., 286; according to him *þe* is here a dative that has become a nominative, as some centuries later *you* became a nominative.

[4] *þe* is a reflexive dative with the subject understood; this is also the view of Voges (*l. c.*, 336 ff.), who is then not able to offer any acceptable explanation of the reflexive dative being used in this text with quite other classes of verbs than elsewhere,

sentence-stress will be reduced to *ye* or even to the short vowel *i*, written *y*. This is especially the case in stock phrases like *thank you* (*thanky*), *God be with you* (*Good-bye*,[1] the *oo*-vowel is probably introduced from the other forms of salutation: *good-morrow*, *good-night*, etc., the naming of *God* being thus avoided; in Shakespeare it is also written *God buy you*), *God give you good even* (in Shakespeare *Godgigoden*, *Godigoden*, *God dig you den*). *Harky* (*hark'ee*) and *look'ee* may contain *ye*, weakened for *you* (§ 86), or the nominative *ye*. I am inclined to think that this phonetic weakening of *you* is the cause of the unstressed *ye* after verbs, which is found so very frequently from the beginning of the sixteenth century, although it is impossible in each single instance to distinguish the *ye* which originates in this way from *ye*'s called forth by the other circumstances dealt with in this chapter.

**97.** (199) Further, we have here to take into account the elision of a final unstressed vowel before a word beginning with a vowel, which was formerly extremely common in English. As early as the thirteenth century we find in Orrm *þarrke* for *þe arrke*, *tunnderrgan* for *to unnderrgan*;[2] in Chaucer the phenomenon is very frequent indeed: *sitt(e) on hors*, *t(o) entende*, *m(e) endyte*, etc.;[3] in more recent

[1] Comp. Skeat, *Principles of Engl. Etymology*, i., 423.

[2] See Kluge in Paul's *Grundriss*, i., 885. Comp. also Old English contractions: *b(e)æftan*, *b(e)ufan*, *b(e)utan*, *n(eh)abban*, etc., Sievers, *Ags. Gr.*, § 110 n.

[3] See Ten Brink, *Chaucers Sprache*, § 269.

periods too you will often find *thold* written for *the old*, and so on. In the Elizabethan period there is plenty of evidence to show that elisions of this kind were of everyday occurrence. The phonetician Hart mentions them expressly, and in his *Orthographie* (1569) he constantly writes, *e.g.*, *ðo·n* (the one), *ðuðer* (the other), *ð' -ius* (the use), *t' ani man* (to any man), *t' iuz* (to use), *d' understand* (do understand), *tu b' aspi·rd* (to be aspired; the dot as a mark of a long vowel is in Hart under the *i*), *houb' it* (how be it), *ð' iuz* (they use), etc. And everybody who is at all familiar with Shakespeare or his contemporaries will know that this elision was in those times of very frequent occurrence, and was very often indicated in the old editions where the modern editors do not choose to mark it. The words *don* for *do on*, *doff* for *do off*, *dup* for *do up*, show the same tendency, and *do* is also curtailed in the formula *much good do it you*, of which the pronunciations "*muskiditti*" and "*mychgoditio*" are expressly mentioned.[1] Similarly where the following word begins with an *h*: *he has* became *has*, written in the old editions *has*, *h'as* or *ha's* (see, for instance, *Tw. N.*, v., 178, 201, 293; *Cor.*, iii., 1, 161, 162); so also *he had* became *h'had* (so

[1] See Ellis, *Early Engl. Pronunciation*, i., 165; and iii., 744. Prof. Skeat explains Shak., *Tim.*, i., 2, 73, "Much good dich thy good heart," by the frequent use of this *d(o)it* before *ye* and *you*; the *t* was there naturally palatalised and assibilated, and as the phrase was taken as an unanalysed whole, the *ch* sound was introduced before *thee* as well; see *Transact. Philol. Soc.*, 1885-7, p. 695.

Marlowe, *Jew*, 25); *they have* became *th' haue* (*Cor.*, i., 2, 30). Now this elision seems to have disappeared from all forms of the language except (the artificially archaic language of the poets and) vulgar speech. In the Cockney Stories, *Thenks awf'lly*, I find among others the following instances:—

*the:* th'air, th'ether (other), th'id (head), etc. | *to:* t'enlearn, t'enimels | *my:* m'arm | *so:* s'help me | *you* (ye): ee y'are (here you are), w'ere y'are (where . . .), y'observe, the mowst crool menner y'ivver see.

**98.** (200) It will be noticed that these phonetic tendencies cannot possibly have had any influence on the case-relations of most pronouns; weaken the vowel of *me* as you like or drop it altogether, the remaining *m'* is not brought one bit the nearer to the nom. *I*. But in the pronouns of the second person there is this peculiarity, that the cases are distinguished by the vowel only; if the vowel is left out it becomes impossible to tell whether the nominative or the accusative is meant—one more reason for the old distinction to become forgotten.

In Chaucer *thee* is elided, see *Cant. T.*, *B.*, 1660, *in thalighte*. In Greene's *Friar Bacon*, 12, 78, "For ere thou hast fitted all things for her state," we must certainly read *th'hast* (see also the same play, 13, 37). In countless passages, where modern editions of Shakespeare read *you're* the old folio has *y'are*, which must no doubt be interpreted *ye are*. But when we find *th'art* (for instance, *Cor.*, iv., 5, 17 and 100, mod.

edd. *thou'rt*), is this to be explained as *thou art* (*thu art*) or as *thee art?* Similarly *th'hast* (mod. edd. *thou'st*), *th'hadst* (mod. edd. *thou hadst*); in *Macb.*, iv., 1, 62 (1312), "Say if th'hadst rather heare it from our mouthes," it is specially difficult to decide in favour of one or the other form on account of the peculiar constructions of *had rather* (see above, § 180).

**99.** (201) There is one more thing to be noticed. Where the pronouns are combined with the verbal forms commencing with *w*, those forms are preferred that contain rounded vowels. The past subjunctive of *y'are* is in Shakespeare *you're* (*Cymb.*, iii., 2, 76, "Madam, you're best consider"); the second person, corresponding to *I'le* for *I will*, is not *ye'le*,[1] but *you'le* (Marlowe, *Jew*, 708), or more frequently *you'll*. Now I take it to be highly probable that these forms were heard in the spoken language at a much earlier period than they are recorded in literature, that is, at a time when *you* was not yet used as a nom., and that they are contracted not from *you were*, *you will*, but from *ye were*, *ye will* (? *ye wol*), the vowel *u* being thus a representative of the *w* of the verb.[2] If this is so,

[1] According to Al. Schmidt's *Lexicon*, *ye'le* is found only once, in the first quarto of *Love's L.*, i., 2, 54, where, however, the second quarto and the folios have *you'll*.

[2] Prof. Herm. Möller, in his review of my Danish edition, accepts this theory, and explains the phonetic connexion somewhat more explicitly than I had done. I beg leave to translate his words: "The vowel *ê* of *ye* combined with the following

we have here yet another reason for the confusion of *ye* and *you*, as the contracted forms *you'll* and *you're* would be felt instinctively as compounds of *you* and *will* or *were*. For *thou wert* we find *thou'rt*;[1] for *thou wilt* similarly *thou'lt* (*e.g.*, Marl., *Jew*, 1144; often in Shakespeare, who also, though rarely, writes *thou't*).

**100.** (202) We have not yet finished our consideration of those phonetic peculiarities which favour the case-shifting of the pronouns of the second person. The pronouns in question were pronounced by Chaucer and his contemporaries as follows:—

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *nom.* | ðu· | je· |
| *acc.* | ðe· | ju· |

Side by side with the long vowel forms we must suppose the existence of shortened forms whenever the pronouns were unstressed or half-stressed; we should accordingly write ðu(·) and ju(·) with wavering vowel quantity. A regular phonetic development of

consonantal *u* or *w* to form the diphthong *iu*. This group of sounds (which might in those times be written *iu*, *iw*, *eu*, *ew*, *u*, etc.) was at a later period changed into *ju* (*juw*), the accent being here, as in the Norse diphthong, shifted from the first on to the second element, which was lengthened; the consonant *y* + *iu*, too, could give no other result than *ju* (*juw*), written in the case before us *you*."

[1] The Shakespearian difference between *thou'rt* and *th'art* (as well as that between *y'are* and *you're*) is totally obscured in modern editions, which give *thou'rt*, *you're* indiscriminately. It is true that *thou'rt* = *thou art* is found in the original editions of some of Shakespeare's plays. *Thou'rt* stands perhaps for *thee wert* in *Temp.*, i., 2, 367, "and be quicke thou'rt best".

these pronunciations would have given the following modern forms (compare mod. *cow* [kau], in Chaucerian English pronounced [ku·], etc.):—

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *nom.* | ðau, †ðu | ji· (ji) |
| *acc.* | ði· (ði) | †jau, ju |

Now it will be noticed that the forms marked with a cross are no longer heard, but their former existence is directly evidenced by the works of the old phoneticians. Bullokar (*Booke at large for the Amendment of Orthographie*, 1580, and *Æsopus*, 1585) always, even when the word is emphatic, writes *thu* with a diacritical stroke under the *u*, meaning the short [u] sound; the same sign is used in *full*, *suffer*, *thumb*, *luck*, *but*, *us*, *put*, etc., all of which were then pronounced with the vowel which has been preserved in the present-day pronunciation of *full*.[1] The spelling *thu* is by no means rare in the sixteenth century; it is used consistently, for instance, by Bale. On the other hand, the following passage in Gil's *Logonomia* (1621, p. 41) shows that a pronunciation of *you* rhyming with *how* and *now* was found in his times; it should be noticed that Gil writes phonetically, that *ou* is found in his book in such words as *hou*, *out*, etc., and that *ü* denotes long [u] (as in Germ. *du*, or perhaps as in Mod. Engl. *do*; Ellis transcribes it *uu*):—

> "Observa, primo *you*] sic scribi solere, et ab aliquibus pronunciari; at a plerisque *yü*: tamen

[1] It is accordingly not correct when Ellis, iii., 902, gives Bullokar as an authority for the pronunciation [dhuu] with long *u*.

quia hoc nondum vbique obtinuit, paulisper in medio relinquetur".[1]

It is in accord with this that in *Roister Doister* (printed 1566) *you* rhymes with *thou* (pp. 31 and 32), with *now* (pp. 15, 43, 48, 53, 60, 63 and 70), and with *inowe* (p. 18).

Now the [au] form of *you* is extinct; the current pronunciation [ju·] or [juw] must be due to a natural lengthening of the originally unstressed form [ju], when it was used with stress.[2] The existence of the form [ju.] at the time of Shakespeare may be concluded from the pun in *Love's Labour*, v., 1, 60.

**101.** (203) In *thou*, on the other hand, it is the fuller form with [au] that is now heard solely: this

[1] On p. 44, in the scheme of pronominal forms, Gil writes *you*, but elsewhere in his phonetic transcriptions he regularly writes *yü*.

[2] Herm. Möller (*l. c.*, p. 308) explains the modern pronunciation [ju·, juw] differently; it is according to him the regular West-Saxon continuation of O. E. *eow*, in First Middle Engl. *êw*, *êu*, which became first *iu* and at last *jū*, just as O. E. *iw*, *eow*, Middle Engl. *êw*, *êu* becomes mod. *yew;* the lengthening of *u* in the group *iu* cannot have taken place till after the long *u* in *hus*, *cu*, etc., had been diphthongised into *ou* [au]. Mod. Engl. *you* therefore is a combination of the spoken form belonging to the South-west, and the written form belonging to the North and East and denoting properly the pronunciation [jau]. Prof. Möller's explanation and mine do not exclude one another: each accounts for the rise of the prevailing pronunciation in one province, and the concurrence of the two identical though independently developed forms would contribute largely to the rejection of the pronunciation [jau].

is quite natural because the word is now never found in colloquial language, so that only the emphatic pronunciation of solemn or ceremonial speech has survived. But when the two pronouns *thou* and *you* were used *pari passu* in ordinary conversation, their sounds were alike; *you* and *thou* formed correct rhymes, exactly as *thee* and *ye* did.[1] But to the formal likeness corresponded a functional unlikeness: *you* is not the same case as *thou*, but as *thee*, and *ye* has the same case-function as *thou*. Are not these cross-associations between sound and sense likely to have exerted some influence on the mutual relations of the forms?

**102.** (204) This supposition becomes the more probable when it is remembered that the pronouns of the second person are different from the other pronouns in that the singular and plural are synonymous. *I* and *we* cannot be used in the same signification, except in the case of the "royal" and "editorial" *we;* but the plural *ye, you* begins very early to be used as a courteous form of addressing a single person. The use of these two manners of address in the Middle English and Early Modern English periods has been treated so exhaustively by Skeat, Abbott, Al. Schmidt, and other scholars, that I need only sum up the chief results of their investigations: The use of

[1] The feeling of *you* and *thou* as parallel forms is manifest in the rhymed dialogue in *Roister Doister*, p. 31: "I would take a gay riche husbande, and I were *you*.—In good sooth, Madge, e'en so would I, if I were *thou*."

the singular and the plural pronouns from Chaucer's times till Shakespeare's, and even till about the middle of the last century (*The Spectator*, Fielding), corresponded pretty nearly to that of the French *tu* and *vous*; but it was looser, as very frequently one person addressed the same other person now with *thou* and now with *ye*, according as the mood or the tone of the conversation changed ever so little. This will be seen in many passages quoted by the scholars just named; compare also:—

> Malory, 94, "Fair lady, why haue *ye* broken my promyse, for *thow* promysest me to mete me here by none, and I maye curse *the* that euer *ye* gaf me this swerd" | Sh., 1 *H. IV.*, ii., 3, 99, "Do *ye* not loue me? Do *ye* not indeed? Well, do not then. For since *you* loue me not I will not loue my selfe. Do *you* not loue me? Nay, tell me, if *thou* speak'st in iest or no."

When matters stand thus, and when the feeling for case-distinctions is shaken in a multiplicity of ways, must not countless confusions and blendings take place in ordinary careless conversation? The speaker begins to pronounce a *ye*, but, half-way through, he falls into the more familiar manner of address, and thus he brings about the compromise *you*, which is accordingly in many instances to be considered a sort of cross between *ye* and *thou*; *you* = *y*(e) + (th)*ou*. Such blendings of two synonyms, where the resulting word consists of the begining of none and the end of

the other word, are by no means rare in language; Shakespeare has *rebuse* = *rebu*(ke) + (a)*buse* (*Shrew*, i., 2, 7), and Tennyson: *be dang'd* = *da*(mned) + (h)*anged* (*Works*, p. 618); but the nearest parallel to our case, that I know of, is the Scottish pronoun *thon* = *th*(at) + (y)*on* (see Murray, *Dial. South. Counties*, p. 186), where in two synonymous pronouns the very same two sounds are interchanged as in the case before us.[1] In *you* there are, as we have seen, many more inducements at work,[2] which all of them concur in causing the cross to be rapidly recognised and accepted by everybody.

**103.** (205) If I am not mistaken, then, *thou* had some share in the rise of the *you* nominative: and I find a corroboration of this theory in the fact that, as far as I know, the earliest known instances of *you* as a nominative (fifteenth century) are found in addressing single individuals. This is the case of the four certain instances pointed out by Zupitza in the *Romance of Guy of Warwick*,[3] where *you* is not yet

[1] An evident blending is seen in *Roister Doister*, 76, "What *sayst you?*" In the same play I find an interesting piece of evidence of the extent to which the feeling for the cases was already weakened; the same sentence in a letter is once read aloud with *ye* (p. 51), and another time with *you* (p. 57): "to take *you* as *ye* (*you*) are".

[2] To those mentioned in the text might be added the influence of the possessive *your*, the vowel of which form would naturally favour *you* and not *ye*.

[3] Namely, ll. 4192, 7053, 7217-8 (where *thou* is used in the lines immediately preceding), and 9847. Prof. Zupitza's fifth

found as a nom. plural. Some of the old grammarians expressly make this distinction :—

Wallis (1653, p. 87): "Notandum item apud nos morem obtinuisse (sicut apud Gallos aliosque nunc dierum) dum quis alium alloquitur, singularem licèt, numerum tamen pluralem adhibendi ; verum tunc *you* dicitur, non *yee*".

Cooper (1685, p. 122): "Pro *thou*, *thee*, et *ye* dicimus *you* in communi sermone, nisi emphaticè, fastidiosè, vel blandè dicimus *thou*". So, p. 139 :—

| *Sum* | *es* | *est* . . . | *estis* . . . |
|---|---|---|---|
| I am | thou art / *you* are | he is | *ye* are |

**104.** (206) But that distinction could not remain stable ; even before the utterances just quoted were written, *you* had in the spoken language found its way to the nominative plural ; Latimer (1549) uses *you* in addressing those whom he has just called *ye lords*, and Shakespeare and Marlowe use *you* and *ye* indiscriminately without any distinction of case or number. If any difference is made it is that of using *you* in emphasis, and *ye* as an unstressed form (comp. above, § 95).

example seems to me to be doubtful: "Y prey yow here A [MS. And] gode councill þat *yow* lere" (l. 6352); it appears more natural to take *lere* = doceat and *yow* as the object. The four certain instances are interesting, in so far as *you* is in all of them found after the verb, cf. above, § 82 ff., in the last of them after *hyt were* and after a *but*, which may have had some influence, cf. § 56.

Marl., *Tamb.*, 3988, "*you, ye* slaves" | 687, "*you* will not sell it, will *ye?*"

See also Abbott, who gives some instances of the use of *you* and *ye* being sometimes the directly opposite of the original case one, *e.g.*,

*Cæs.*, iii., 1, 157, "I do beseech *yee*, if *you* beare me hard".

In some of the last plays Shakespeare wrote, *you* is practically the only form used,[1] and not long after his death *ye* must be considered completely extinct in spoken Standard English.[2] But *ye* is not entirely forgotten; the Bible and the old literature keep up the memory of it, and cause it to be felt as a form belonging to a more solemn and poetic sphere than the prosaic *you*. The consequence is that many poets make constant use of *ye* in preference to *you*. While in ordinary language the paradigm is:—

nom. sg. *you*
acc. sg. *you*
nom. pl. *you*
acc. pl. *you*,

[1] As there is a marked difference in the frequency of *ye* and *you* in Shakespeare's plays (and perhaps also in the use of the contracted forms *th'art*, *thou'rt*, etc.), I once thought it possible to supplement the already existing tests, metrical and others, by which the chronology of his writings is determined, with a *you*-test; but want of time prevented me from undertaking the necessary statistical investigations—which might, after all, have led to no results of any value.

[2] If Thackeray's representation of the dialect spoken by the Irish is to be trusted, *ye* seems to belong to their everyday language.

in Byron's *Cain* (to take a poetical work at random) everything is so entirely different that, to look only at this pronoun, one would scarcely believe it to be the same language :—

nom. sg. *thou*
acc. sg. *thee*
nom. pl. *ye*
acc. pl. *ye*.

*You* is practically non-existent in that work ; I find it only on p. 252 (*Works*, ed. Tauchnitz, vol. iv.), " And *you*, *ye* new And scarce-born mortals," and p. 224, where it is used in the indefinite signification of the French *on*.

The old *ye* has yet another refuge, namely, in grammars, where it renders the separate plural forms of other languages, Latin *vos*, German *Ihr*, etc. If this small domain is excepted, the English seem never to feel any inconvenience from their language having the same form for the singular and the plural in this pronoun ; if a separate form is now and then required for distinction's sake the want is easily remedied—after the Chinese fashion, as it were—by the addition of some noun : *you people*, *you gentlemen*, *you girls*, *you chaps*, *you fellows*, etc.

**105.** (207) To return to the original singular of the second person. As an early instance of vacillation between *thou* and *thee* I shall mention :—

Chauc., *A. B. C.* (= *M. P.*, 1), 107, " O tresorere of bounte to mankynde, *The* whom God ches to moder for humblesse ! "

where the *the* is probably caused by relative attraction; but one MS. has *yee*, and another *þou*.[1] The double reading *thou* (Ellesm. MS.) and *thee* in :—

Chauc., *H.*, 40, "Fy, stinking swyn, fy! foule mot *thee* falle!"

is, I take it, owing to a vacillation between the personal and impersonal constructions.

In the Elizabethan literature *thee* is not rare as a nominative, though it is on the other hand far less frequent than *you;* we have already seen the explanation of some instances of *thee*, among others 2 *H. VI.*, i., 2, 69, "Here's none but thee and I," where *thee* is placed side by side with *I; Haml.*, v., 2, 63, "Thinkst thee"; and several instances of *thee* after *it is*. But these explanations do not hold good in the following quotations :—

Marlowe, *Jew*, 1056, "What hast *thee* done?" | Sh., 1 *H. IV.*, i., 2, 127, "How agrees the diuell and *thee* about thy soule, that *thou* soldest him?" | Dryden, *Poems*, ii., 220, "Scotland and *Thee* did each in other live"

[1] In some passages of the old authors *thee* and *yee* may have been confounded on account of the þ-letter, which has often been mistaken for a *y*, especially in the article (*Roister Doister*, 23, "What is *ye* matter?"). This is perhaps the explanation of Chaucer, *E.*, 508, "Ne I (ne) desyre no thing for to haue, Ne drede for to lese, saue only *ye*," where two MSS. have "*thee* vel *yee*," two *ye* and three *thee*. As Grisildis generally addresses her husband as *ye*, not *thou*, *ye* is probably the correct reading, and then the sentence comes under the category dealt with in § 57.

| Lewis Morris, *Poet. Works*, 74, "What I worship is not wholly *thee*".

**106.** (208) Here we have really a *thee* nominative, and this nominative is also often found where the use of the old singular pronoun is in living use, irrespective of literary or ecclesiastical tradition. Thus *thee* has ousted *thou* in most of those dialects where *you* has not become the only form used; see, for instance, Elworthy, *Grammar of West Somerset*, p. 35; Lowsley, *Berkshire Words and Phrases*, p. 6; Mrs. Parker, *Glossary of Words used in Oxfordshire* (*E. Dial. Soc.*, c. 5 [1]). We must here also mention the Quakers (or Society of Friends); in the last century their usage does not seem to have been fully settled: witness the following quotations, where Quakers are introduced as speaking:—

*Spectator*, 132 (Aug. 1, 1711), "*Thee* and I are to part by-and-by. . . . When two such as *thee* and I meet . . . *thou* should'st rejoice" (in what follows he also sometimes says *thou*) | Fielding, *Tom Jones*, ii., 127, "Perhaps, *thou* hast lost a friend. If so,

[1] Here we read about a pronunciation "with a very obscure vowel sound"; is this a continuation of the form *thu* with short [u], mentioned above, § 99? In Mid-Yorkshire *thou* seems still to be used, even as an accusative, according to Mr. Robinson, whose words are not, however, completely clear; see *E. Dial. Soc.*, v., p. xxiii. In the dialect of Windhill in the West Riding of Yorkshire, as described by Dr. J. Wright (*E. Dial. Soc.*, 1892, p. 116), the old case-distinction is preserved, except when the pronouns are used absolutely.

*thou* must consider we are all mortal. And why should'st *thou* grieve when *thou* knowest. . . . I myself have my sorrow as well as *thee*." [1]

In this century the prevalence of *thee* is shown by the following statements :—[2]

H. Christmas, in Pegge's *Anecd.*, 3rd ed., 131, a Quaker rarely says, "I hope thou art well; wilt thou come and dine with me?"—but, "I hope *thee* are well; will *thee* come and dine with me?"

Gummere, *l. c.*, 285, "In point of fact, few members of the Society of Friends use *thou* in familiar speech. They use the singular in familiar speech, but . . . it is the dat.-nom. *thee*, not *thou*. . . . I have seen a familiar letter of an educated Friend, written in the early part of the eighteenth century, where the *thee* is used as nom., though any solemn passage calls out a formal *thou*. . . . The most remarkable case I ever observed was where a lady, not a Friend, extended to several visitors, who were of that sect, an invitation as follows: 'Won't *thee* all walk into this room?'"

[1] In the same book, Squire Western also occasionally uses *thee* as a nom.; see iv., 309, "I know her better than *thee* dost".

[2] See also Abbott, *Shakesp. Gramm.*, § 205; Storm, *Engl. Philol.*, p. 209 (from *Uncle Tom's Cabin*); Wash. Moon, *Ecclesiast. English*, p. 170.

In Miss Muloch's *John Halifax, Gentleman*, the Friends constantly use this *thee*:—

I., 1, "*Thee* need not go into the wet" | 3, "Unless *thee* wilt go with me" | 4, "Where dost *thee* come from? Hast *thee* any parents living? How old might *thee* be? *Thee* art used to work" | 5, "*Thee* shall take my son home . . . art *thee* . . ." | 11, "*Thee* be . . . has *thou* . . . *thee*'rt" | 15, "*Thee* works . . . *thee* hast never been" | 23, "Didn't *thee* say *thee* wanted work? . . . *thee* need'st not be ashamed . . . Hast *thee* any money?" | 24, "Canst *thee*" | 26, "Canst *thee* drive? . . . *thee* can drive the cart . . . *thee* hasn't" | 28, "*Thee* said *thee* had no money" | 49, "*Thee* doesn't,"[1] etc., etc.

---

**107.** (209) Here I end my survey of the various case-shifting agencies and of their operations. As already mentioned, it extremely often happens that in the same sentence two or more causes co-operate to make the speaker use a different case from what we should expect, or rather from what the grammar of an earlier stage of the language would require. The more frequently such concurrences occur, the greater the vitality of the new manner of using the

[1] I do not know whether the inconsistencies in the use of the different persons of the verbs must be ascribed to the authoress, or if they really occur (or occurred) in the language as actually spoken by the Quakers.

case in question. We saw in § 76 that two separate tendencies, whose effects do not appear properly till some two hundred years later, were powerful enough when co-operating to bring about a visible (that is, an audible) result. And on reading again the quotations used to illustrate the first sections of this chapter you will find that the forms in *e* supply a comparatively greater contingent than the other forms, showing thus the concurrence of the associations treated in § 91. The facts which have been brought to light will, moreover, have made it clear that with the pronouns of the second person more shifting agencies were at work than with the rest (§§ 86, 87, 91-102), the result being that the original case-relations have been completely revolutionised in these pronouns. In the case of *I* and *me*, too, some special causes of changes in the case-relations have been pointed out (§§ 90, 91); but they proved to be much less powerful than those seen in the second person, and operated besides in opposite directions, so that the same simplicity as that found in *you* was here impossible. Finally, we have seen that the invariable position of *who* before the verb has caused it to become a common case, *whom* being relegated to a very limited province which it did not properly belong to.

**108.** (210) There is one factor I have not taken into account, though it is nearly everywhere given as explaining the majority of case-shiftings in a great many languages,—I mean the *tendency to let the objective case prevail over the subjective case*. My reason

is simply that this tendency cannot be considered as a cause of case-shiftings ; it does not show us how these are called forth in the mind of the speaker; it *indicates the direction of change and the final result, but not its why and wherefore.* Nay, in English, at least, it does not even exhaustively indicate the direction of change, as will be gathered from some points in the above exposition: the nominative carries the day in the absolute construction, in *who* and in the (vulgar) combination *between you and I;* note also the change of the case used with the old impersonal verbs. Still, it must be granted that the nominative generally has the worst of it ; this is a consequence of the majority of the case-shifting agencies operating in favour of the accusative ; thus, while it is only the position immediately before the verb that supports the nominative, the accusative is always the most natural case in any other position ; see, for instance, the treatment of *than* as a preposition.

**109.** (211) This will afford an explanation of the fact that wherever we see the development of special emphatic or "absolute" pronouns as opposed to conjoint pronouns (used in direct conjunction with the verb), the former will as a rule be taken from the originally oblique cases, while the nominative is restricted to some sort of unstressed affix to the verb.

Such a development is not carried through in Standard English, which has formed the principal subject of our investigations. But if we turn to the

dialects now existing in England, we shall find this *distinction of absolute and conjoint pronouns* made very frequently. A thorough examination of the case-relations of living dialects would present very great interest, although it would rather show the results of similar developments to those found in the literary language—with many deviations, it is true —than throw any fresh light on the agencies at work or the causes of the changes effected. These are best investigated in the literary language, because we there have materials from so many succeeding centuries that we are often enabled to discover the first germs of what living dialects would only present to us as a development brought to a definite (or preliminary) conclusion. For this reason, as well as for the obvious one that the dialects of our own days have not been so fully and reliably treated, especially with regard to syntax, as to render a satisfactory exposition possible, I shall content myself with a few remarks only on the pronouns in the dialects.

**110.** (212) In the dialect of the southern counties of Scotland, so admirably treated by Dr. Murray an emphatic form, originating in the old accusative, is used very much as the corresponding forms in French, *e.g.*, *Thaim* 'at hæs, aye geates mair; *mey*, *aa* canna gang (moi je ne peux pas aller); *yuw* an' *mey* 'll gang ower the feild. "He gave it to you" = hey gæ *ye'd*; "he gave it to YOU" = hey gæ *yuw'd*; "he gave IT to you" = hey gæ *ye hyt*; "he gave IT to YOU" = hey gæ *yuw hyt*.

For the dialect of West Somerset, Elworthy gives no less than six series of forms, *viz.*, for the *nominative:* (1) "full" forms, used when the nominative stands before its verb with emphasis; among these forms we notice the old objective forms *dhee* and *yùe;* perhaps also *uur*, "her," if Dr. Murray is not right in considering it as the old nom. *heo;* (2) unemphatic forms used before the verb, generally the same forms as in the first series, only weakened [*ee* = ye?]; (3) interrogative enclitic forms, among which [*ees*] *us* is noticeable as being used exactly as the Shakespearian *us* in *shall's*, see above, § 84; in the third person pl. *um* = O. E. *heom* is used in the same manner; and (4) unconnected forms, all of them old accusatives, except *he* (*ee*), compare § 94, and *dhai*. Then for the *objective* case we have two series of forms: (1) the unemphatic, of which we note the second person pl. *ee* = ye and the third person sg. masc., *un*, *n* = O. E. *hine*, see § 49; and (2) emphatic or prepositional, among these *aay* concurrently with *mee*, and *wee* with *uus* (§ 94), and on the same principle also *ee·* (he) and *shee·;* finally *dhai*. *Whom* has here as well as in Scotch been completely superseded by *who*.

In the vulgar dialects of the town populations (especially of the London Cockney) the accusative has been victorious, except when the pronoun is used in immediate conjunction with the verb as its subject; a point of special interest is the use of *them* as an attribute adjective before a noun. As examples

abound everywhere, I shall give only a few, of which the first and third are peculiarly instructive for the distinction of absolute and conjoint forms:—[1]

Dickens, *M. Ch.*, 352, "'Don't *they* expect you then?' inquired the driver. 'Who?' said Tom. 'Why, *them*,' returned the driver" | *Orig. Engl.*, 140, "*Him* and mother and baby and *me* could all go with him" | 123, "*Them* paddling steamers is the ones for goin'. *They* just begin to puff a bit first." Compare, however, 90, "*Them*'s the two I see".

**111.** (213) To return to Standard English. We see that the phenomena dealt with in this chapter bear on *accidence* (*you*, *who*), on *syntax* (*himself* as the subject, the absolute nominative, the subject of passive verbs, etc.) and finally on *word signification* (the meaning of some of the old impersonal verbs now being changed; the old *like* = "to be pleasant," the modern *like* = "to be pleased with"). I shall here call special attention to the latent though complete change which has taken place in the grammatical construction of more than one phrase while seemingly handed down unchanged from generation to generation. I am thinking of such phrases as:—

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | if *you* | *like*, |
| | if *you* | *please*, |
| formerly: | dat. (pl.) | 3rd pers. sg. subjunct. |
| now: | nom. (sg. or pl.) | 2nd pers. (sg. or pl.) indic. |

[1] See also Miss Muloch, *J. Halifax*, 207: "Let us talk of something else. Of Miss March? *She* has been greatly better all day? *She?* No, not *her* to-day."

Compare also *you were better do it*, where *you* was a dative and is now the subject in the nominative, and where simultaneously *were* has changed imperceptibly from the third person singular (*it* being understood) to the second person pl. or sg. In handing something to some one you will often say, "*Here you are!*" meaning, "Here is something for you, here is what you want". I think that this phrase too contains an old dative; and perhaps, some centuries ago, in handing only one thing, people would say, "Here you is!"[1]

**112.** (214) A scheme of the pronominal forms treated in the present chapter according to their values in the every-day language of the close of the nineteenth century would look something like this:—

| Subject, joined to the verb: | Nominative, when not joined to the verb: | Everywhere else: |
|---|---|---|
| *I, we* | *me, we* | *me, us* |
| *you* | *you* | *you* |
| *he, she, they* | *he, she, they* | *him, her, them* |
| (*himself, herself,* | *himself, herself,* | *himself, herself,* |
| *themselves*) | *themselves* | *themselves* |
| *who* | *whom, who* | *who* |

**113.** (215) If now finally we ask: Are the changes described in this chapter on the whole progressive?

[1] Another case in point is perhaps the obsolete combination with *force;* Chaucer has "no force" (*fors*) with the meaning "no matter, it does not matter": *force* is here the noun, Fr. *force.* If this was used with a dative (Sh., *Love's L.*, v., 2, 440, "*you force* not to forsweare") it would look like a verb, and the next step would then be to use it as in Sh., *Lucr.*, 1021, "*I force* not argument a straw".

the answer must be an affirmative one. Although for obvious reasons personal pronouns are more apt to preserve old irregularities than other classes of words, we find instead of the old four irregular forms, *thou*, *thee*, *ye* and *you*, one form carried through uniformly; the same uniformity is, as far as case is concerned, observable in the *self*-forms as compared with the old *he self*, *hine self*, etc., and *who* shows almost the same indifference to cases. Then there is some progress in syntax which does not appear from the scheme just given. Many of the uncertainties in the choice of case exemplified in the early sections of the chapter are owing to a want of correspondence between the logical and grammatical categories; for instance, when a word might be logically, but not grammatically, the subject. Sometimes, also, one grammatical rule would require one case, and another equally applicable rule a different one. The inconsistency was particularly glaring where the logical (and psychological) subject was to be put in quite another case than that generally used to denote the subject; and here, with the old impersonal verbs and in the absolute construction, logic has completely conquered the old grammar. The rule which is entirely incompatible with the old state of things, that the word immediately preceding the verb is logically and grammatically the subject of the sentence, has been carried through on the whole with great consistency. And in the great facility which the English have now acquired of making the real psychological subject

grammatically the subject of a passive sentence, the language has gained a decided advantage over the kindred languages, an advantage which Danish is even now struggling to acquire, in spite of the protests of the schoolmaster grammarians. Thus we see that many phenomena, which by most grammarians would be considered as more or less gross blunders or "bad grammar," but which are rather to be taken as natural reactions against the imperfections of traditional language, are really, when viewed in their historical connexion, conducive to progress in language.

## CHAPTER III.

### THE ENGLISH GROUP GENITIVE.

**114.** To a mind trained exclusively in Latin (or German) grammar such English constructions as "the Queen of England's power," or "he took somebody else's hat," must seem very preposterous; the word that ought to be in the genitive case (*Queen*, *somebody*) is put in the nominative or accusative, while in the one instance *England*, whose power is not meant, and in the other even an adverb, is put in the genitive case. Similarly, in the case of "words in apposition," where it might be expected that each would be put in the genitive, as in "King Henry the Eighth's reign," only one of them takes the genitive ending.

**115.** In an interesting and suggestive article, "Die genetische erklärung der sprachlichen ausdrucksformen" (*Englische Studien*, xiv., 99), H. KLINGHARDT makes an attempt to explain this as well as other peculiarities of English grammar (the passive, in "the request was complied with," "he was taken no notice of," "with one another," etc.), by the power of the accent. "In English," he says, "unstressed

vowels are weaker than in German ; and the distinction between stressed and unstressed syllables greater. So it is with the stressed words of a sentence in relation to the unstressed words surrounding them ; the action of stress therefore reaches farther than in German ; emphatic words are capable of gathering around them a greater number of weak words than in German. . . . The [German] pupil will now understand how easily and conveniently in English small groups of words, such as *King Henry the Eighth*, are joined together under one accent, and are inflected, put in the Saxon genitive, etc., exactly in the same manner as single words."

**116.** I do not think that this theory is the correct one, and I shall state my objections. In the first place, we are not told which word in the group is invested with that powerful accent that is said to keep the group together. Nothing hinders us from pronouncing a group like "King Richard the Second's reign" at one moment with strong stress on Richard (as opposed to, say, *Edward* II.) and at the next with great emphasis on the numeral (as opposed to Richard the *Third*) ; we may also pronounce the two words with even stress ; yet in all of these cases the grammatical construction is the same. Next, if we adopt Dr. Klinghardt's theory, we must assume an historical change in English accent which seems to be supported by no other fact. And thirdly, the theory fails completely to account for the difference between the *final s* in genitives like *Queen of England s* or *sister-in-*

*law's*, and the *internal s* in plurals like *the queens of England* or *sisters-in-law*.

Before venturing to propose a new explanation it will be well to look somewhat closely at the historical development of the several phenomena with which we are here concerned. I shall group my examples under six heads.

## I.

**117. Attributive words** (adjectives, articles) were in Old English and in the first period of Middle English inflected equally with the substantives to which they belonged. But as early as the beginning of the thirteenth century we find the modern construction used alongside with the old one: thus in the case of the definite article:—

*Ancren Riwle*, 82, "*þes* deofles bearn, *þes* deofles bles" | 84, "*þes* deofles corbin" | 142, "*tes* deofles puffes" | 188, "*tes* deofles bettles," etc. | | 210, "*ðe* deofles seruise" | 212 and 216, "*ðe* deofles kurt" | 212, "*ðe* deofles berme" | 134, "of *þe* deofles gronen," etc.

I have not examined the matter closely enough to be positive, but it seems as if the uninflected form was chiefly used after prepositions, and it is not entirely improbable that the uninflected genitive of the article originates in those cases where the article belongs as properly or more properly to the noun following than to the genitive: *in the* (devil's) *service*,

or *in the devils-service*.[1] Examples of adjectives from the same text:—

402, "of *reades* monnes blod" | 110, "his moderes wop & þe *oðres* Maries" | 406, "*mines* federes luue" | 48, "*eueriches* limes uelunge" | 180, "*eueriches* flesches eise" | 194, "þisses worldes figelunge" | 198, "þisses hweolpes nurice" | | 94, "*euerich* ones mede" | 112, "*euerich* monnes fleschs" | 6, "efter *euch* ones manere" | 134, "efter *euerich* ones efne".

**118.** In Chaucer we find no single trace of an inflected genitive of any attributive adjective; the rapid disappearance of the *s* in the gen. may to a great extent be due to the analogical influence of the weak forms of the adjective, in which after the loss of the final *n* the endings were the same for the genitive as for all the other cases.

In present-day English most adjectives are placed before their nouns, and then are never inflected; an adjective put after its noun is only capable of assuming the genitive *s* in cases like *Henry the Eighth's;* it is impossible to say, for example, *the women present's opinions*. Comp. Marlowe, *Jew*, 242, "That you will needs haue *ten years* [genitive!] tribute *past*" (= the tr. of ten years past).

II.

**119.** Two or more **words in apposition.** Examples of the old full inflexion:—

[1] The same explanation holds good for the adj. in *A. R.*, 190, "Uor *al* þe worldes golde".

*A. S. Chron., E.*, 853, "*Æðelwulfes* dohtor West Seaxna *cininges*" | *ibid., A.*, 918, "Of *Eadweardes cyninges* anwalde" | *ibid., D.*, 903, "Aþulf ealdorman, *Ealhswyðe* broðor, *Eadweardes moder cynges* (brother of Ealhswyðe, the mother of King Edward)" | Ælfric, Sweet's *A. S. Reader*, 14 b, 7, "On *Herodes* dagum *cyninges*" | *ibid.*, 136, "*Iacobes* wif *ðæs heahfæderes*" | *ibid.*, 15, 231, "*Aidanes* sawle *þæs halgan bisceopes*" | *A. R.*, 312, "We beoð alle *Godes* sunen *þe kinges* of heouene" | Ch., *M.*, ii., 349 (1021), "By my *modres Ceres* soule".

It will be observed that the two words in apposition are frequently separated by the governing word; in the following two instances we cannot decide by the form whether the last words are in the nominative or in the genitive case, as neither of them formed the genitive in *s* at that period :—

*A. R.*, 146, "*Hesteres* bone *þe cwene*" | *ibid.*, 412, "*Seinte Marie* dei *Magdalene*".

**120.** But in a great many cases, where we have this word-order—and it is, indeed, the order most frequently used throughout the M. E. period [1]—there can be no doubt that the last word is put in the nominative (or common) case. The leaving out of the case-sign is rare in Old English, but extremely

[1] Cf. Zupitza's note to *Guy of Warwick*, l. 687, where many examples are collected ("on þe maydenys halfe Blanchflowe," etc.), and Kellner, *Blanchardyn*, cvii.

common in Middle English; in Modern English it is getting rarer again. The phenomenon is to be classed with those mentioned above, § 61.

*A. S. Chron., E.*, 855, "To *Karles* dohtor Francna *cining*" | *A. R.*, 148, "*Moiseses* hond, Godes *prophete*" | *ibid.*, 244, "þuruh *Iulianes* heste *þe amperur*" | 352, "Ine *Jesu Cristes* rode, mi *louerd*" | Ch., *Hous of F.*, 142, "*Seys* body *the king*" | 282, "The *kinges* meting *Pharao*" | Ch., *B.*, 431, "*Kenulphus* sone, the noble *king* of Mercenrike" | *F.*, 672, "The god *Mercurius* hous the *slye*" | *L. G. W.*, 1468, "Isiphilee the shene, That whylom *Thoas* doghter was, the *king*" | Malory, 70, "By my *faders* soule *Vtherpendragon*" | 91, "Gaweyn shalle reuenge his *faders* deth *kynge Loth*" | 126, "In his *wyues* armes *Morgan le fay*" | Marl., *Tamburl.*, 193, "In the circle of your *fathers* armes, The mightie *Souldan* of Egyptia" | Greene, *Friar B.*, 2, 10, "To *Bacon's* secret cell, A *friar* newly stall'd in Brazennose" | Sh., 1 *H. IV.*, ii., 4, 114, "I am not yet of *Percies* mind, the *Hotspurre* of the North, *he* that killes me some sixe or seauen dozen of Scots" | Matt., xiv., 3 (Auth. V.), "For *Herodias'* sake, his brother Philip's *wife*" | Wycherley (Mermaid Ser.), 24, "He has now pitched his nets for *Gripe's* daughter, the rich *scrivener*" | Tennyson, 322, "*Merlin's*

hand, the *Mage* at Arthur's court" | Mth. Arnold, *Poems*, i., 191, "Doubtless thou fearest to meet *Balder's* voice, *Thy brother*, whom through folly thou didst slay".[1]

**121.** In Middle English the opposite word-order with the whole genitival group before the governing word, is sometimes found; and in course of time it becomes more frequent; the genitive sign is only added to the last word. This construction is especially frequent when a proper name is preceded by a title, while it is generally avoided when the proper name is followed by a somewhat lengthy apposition. I have not thought it necessary to give many modern examples:—

*O. E. Homilies*, ii., 3, "After *ure lauerd ihesu cristes* tocume" | Ch., *L. G.*, 2247, "*King Pandiones* faire doghter" | *F.*, 672, "The *god Mercurius* hous" | Zupitza's *Guy*, 1956, "*The dewke Segwyns* cosyn" | *ibid.*, 8706, "*The kynge Harkes* lande" | Malory, 232, "*My lady my susters* name is dame Lyonesse" | *Roister*, 67, "For *my friende Goodluck's* sake" | Marl., *Tamb.*, 1168, "By *Mahomet my kinsmans* sepulcher" | Thack., *P.*, i., 18, "Miss Hunkle, of Lilybank, *old Hunkle the Attorney's* daughter".

[1] Mth. Arnold, *Poems*, i., 152, we have a closely connected phenomenon, namely, the repetition of a genitive in the common case, in order to tack on to it a relative clause: "And straight he will come down to *Ocean's* strand, *Ocean* whose watery ring enfolds the world".

**122.** When the governing word is not expressed, the *s*-ending is—or was—often added to the first noun exclusively; Lindley Murray says (*Grammar*, 8th edit., p. 262) that of the three forms, "I left the parcel at Smith's, the bookseller": or "at Smith, the bookseller's": or "at Smith's, the bookseller's,"—the first is most agreeable to the English idiom; and if the addition consists of two or more nouns, the case seems to be less dubious; as, "I left the parcel at Smith's, the bookseller and stationer". This does not now apply to a group consisting of a title and a proper name, as it did formerly, witness the first two of the following quotations, which would in modern speech be *King Alexander's* and *Admiral Presane's*. Even the last example does not seem to be now very natural; and custom is perhaps more and more in favour of saying "at Smith, the bookseller's," or "at Smith's, the bookseller's," unless "the bookseller" is only part of a phrase, *e.g.*, "at Smith's, the bookseller in Trinity Street". At least, this is the opinion of Mr. G. C. Moore Smith.

*Guy of Warw.*, 7921, "Hyt [the helme] was *Alysawndurs the kynge*" | *ibid.*, 8714, "Hyt [the cuntre] ys *admyrals Presane*" | Sh., *H. V.*, i., 2, 105, "Inuoke his warlike spirit, and *your great vnckles, Edward the Black Prince*" | | Thack., *P.*, i., 259, "He managed to run up a fine bill *at Nine's, the livery stable-keeper*" | *ibid.*, ii., 199, "I remember *at poor Rawdon Crawley's*, Sir Pitt Crawley's

*brother*" | Beaconsf., *Loth.*, 16, "Villas like *my cousin's, the Duke of Luton*".

**123.** When **one of the words in apposition is a personal pronoun** a special difficulty arises from the genitive proper being here replaced by a possessive pronoun. What is the genitive of "we, the tribunes"? It would be a little awkward to say "our, the tribunes' power," and so most people would probably say with Shakespeare (*Cor.*, iii., 3, 100), "the power *of vs the tribunes*".

The want of a comprehensive genitive is most frequently felt when *all* or *both* is subjoined to *we, you*, or *they*. Here O. E. had a fully inflected form, *heora begra* lufu, "the love of them both"; *heora begra* eagan, "the eyes of them both" (in M. E. often with the gen. form, *bather, bother*), *ealra ura*. A few examples will show this combination in M. E.:—

*Lay.*, 5283 (quoted by Koch, ii., 240), "*Heore beire* nome ich þe wulle telle" | *Leg. St. Kath.*, 1790, "*Hare baðre* luue" | Perc., 31, "At *ther botheres* wille" | | *A. R.*, 52, "Eue *vre alre* moder" | Ch., *A.*, 799, "At *our aller* cost" | *ibid.*, 823, "Up roos our hoste, and was *our aller* cok" | *M. P.*, i., 84, "*Oure alder* foo" | *L. G. W.*, 298, "*Our alder* pris" | Mal., 134, "Kynge Arthur, *our alther* liege lord" | James I., King's Q., "*ȝoure alleris* frende" (in NED, *all* D. ii., 4, cf. *ibid.*, *both* 4 b, and see also Mätzner, *Wb.*, "*all* a 4, and *beȝen*").

Note the excrescent *-es* in *botheres* and *alleris*, show-

ing that the value of the old genitive ending had been forgotten. In a few cases we find the common gen. ending added to *both* :—

Ch., *M. P.*, 1, 83, "But, for *your bothes* peynes, I you preye" | Mal., 98, "To *our bothes* destruction";

but in the great majority of cases *both* and *all* are used without any ending; the possessive is generally placed after the adjective, but the two first examples will show the opposite order :—

Ch., *B.*, 221, "Diversitee bitwene *her bothe* lawes" | *M. P.*, 4, 52, "by *her bothe* assent" | Mal., 71, "*Both her* swerdys met euen to gyders" | 79, "I haue *both their* hedes" | 151, "Layd the naked swerd ouerthwart *bothe their* throtes" | *Roister*, 31, "To *both our* heartes ease" | Marl., *Tamb.*, 4644, "*Both their* worths" | Greene, *F. B.*, 8, 110, "*Both our* carcases" | Sh., *W. T.*, v., 3, 147, "*Both your* pardons" | *R. II.*, iii., 3, 107, "By the royalties of *both your* bloods" | *Cor.*, i., 6, 8, "*Both our* powers" | *ibid.*, iii., 1, 103, "*Both your* voices" | *R. III.*, i., 2, 191, "To *both their* deaths" | *T. S.*, v., 2, 15, "For *both our* sakes" | Milton, *P. L.*, vi., 170, "As *both their* deeds compared this day shall prove" | Thack., *V. F.*, 258, "*Both their* husbands were safe" | *ibid.*, 507, "*Both their* lives" | *Pend.*, i., 304, "That warmth belonged to *both their* natures" | R. Browning, iii., 306, "For *both their* sakes".

**124.** It will be noticed that in most cases it is perfectly immaterial to the meaning of the passage whether we take *both* as qualifying the pronoun or the following substantive, as each of us has only one head, one throat, one life, etc. But in other instances the same consideration does not hold good; when we read, for instance, in *John Halifax, Gent.*, ii., 76, "the name set *both our thoughts* anxiously wandering," the meaning cannot be that each of them had only got one wandering thought, so that *both* must certainly here be taken as a genitive case. But the tendency goes undoubtedly in the direction of taking *both* as a nominative, the construction being avoided whenever that would be obviously impossible: I suppose it would be fruitless to search through the whole of the English literature for a connexion like "*both our four eyes*," although, indeed, Fielding writes (*Tom Jones*, iii., 45): "*Both their several talents* were excessive" (each had several talents); compare *ibid.*, iii., 66, "The two ladies who were riding side by side, looking steadfastly at each other; at the same moment *both their eyes* became fixed; both their horses stopt," etc.

On the other hand, "the sb. often improperly took the plural form by attraction of the pronoun;[1] this idiom is still in vulgar use, as 'It is *both your faults*,'

[1] The same sort of attraction may occasionally be found where there is no such word as *both* to assist in occasioning it; see Thack., *Ballads*, 80, "The ladies took the hint, And all day were scraping lint, As became their softer *genders*".

'she is *both their mothers*'" (Murray, *N. E. D.*). This I take to be the reason of the pl. *hopes* in Marl., *Jew*, 879, "He loues my daughter, and she holds him dear. But I have sworn to frustrate *both their hopes*." (They have one and the same hope.) So also in :—

> Sh., *All's*, i., 3, 169, "You are my mother, Madam; would you were (So that my Lord your sonne were not my brother) indeed my mother, or were you *both our mothers* . . ." | *Ro.*, ii., 3, 51, "*Both our remedies* Within thy helpe and holy physicke lies (note the sg. of the verb) | Fielding, *T. J.*, iii., 82, "It was visible enough from *both our behaviours*".[1]

Examples of the group genitive with *all* preceding a possessive pronoun :—

[1] Mr. G. C. Moore Smith criticises the view expressed in the text, writing as follows: "I think you are right on 'both your faults'. But in 'both our mothers' and 'both their hopes' I think the notion is plural, as well as the expression. She is—both our—mothers. That is, the mind conceives the two persons for a moment as having each a mother (or a hope of his own)—and then identifies these mothers and hopes. Even if you and I hope for the same end, there are two hopes. If you lost yours, I might keep mine. Of course it may be true, as you say, that the use of the plural is due to attraction from *both:* still it carries with it a sense of plurality, which is present to the speaker's mind. So with 'genders'=as became the sex of each one, sex being looked on as an individual attribute like her name."

Ch., *M. P.*, 5,618, "I have herd *al youre* opinion" | *F.*, 396, "*Alle her* hertes" | *B.*, 4562, "Hir housbondes losten *alle hir* lyves" | Mal., 134, "*All their* harneis" | Marl., *Tamb.*, 1877, "*All our* bloods" | Sh., *Cor.*, iv., 6, 35, "*All our* lamentation" | Sheridan, *Dr. W.*, 68, "Tell her 'tis *all our* ways" | Dick., *M. Ch.*, 400, "For *all our* sakes" | Stevenson, *Tr. Isl.*, 283, "It went to *all our* hearts" | Hood, "He had drunk up all the stout to *all their* very good healths" | G. Eliot, *Mill*, ii., 210, "All their hearts are set on Tom's getting back the mill".

**125.** As the subject of the action expressed by a verbal noun in *-ing* is sometimes put in the genitive (I insist on *your* coming) and sometimes in the common case (I insist on *all* coming), a possibility arises of combining these two expressions; note the different ways in which this is done in the following examples:—

Sheridan, "I insist on *your all* meeting me here" | *ibid.*, *Dram. Works*, 56, "The confusion that might arise from *our both* addressing the same lady" | Fielding, *T. J.*, iii., 71, "It cannot be wondered at that *their* retiring *all* to sleep at so unusual an hour should excite his curiosity" | Dick., quoted by Koch, "*Our all three* coming together was a thing to talk about" | Beaconsf., *Lothair*, 435, "I fancy the famous luncheons at Crecy House

will always go on, and be a popular mode of *their all* meeting" ;

where, perhaps, *of all of them meeting* (or: for them all to meet) would be preferable; but note that the order of the words *all their*, ordinary as it is in other cases, is here inadmissible.

**126.** Here I finally quote some passages where *of* is used to avoid *all our* :—

Ch., *G.*, 192, "Iesu Crist, herde *of vs alle*" | Malory, 84, "The names *of them bothe*" | Greene, *F. B.*, 10, 17, "The liking fancy *of you both*" | *ibid.*, 10, 25, "To avoid displeasure *of you both*" | Thack., *P.*, ii., 215, "The happiest fortnight in the lives *of both of them*" | *ibid.*, 220, "The characters *of both of you* will be discussed" | *ibid.*, 329, 337, etc. | *Frank Fairl.*, i., 337, "She was the life and soul *of us all*" | Troll., *Duke's Ch.*, i., 254, "For the happiness *of them all*".

For the genitive of *both of you*, *some of you*, etc., cf. below, § 130.

**127.** For the genitive of *we two*, etc., I am able to give four quotations: showing, first, the old genitive of *two;* then the unchanged form; thirdly, the rare *s*-gen.; and finally an evasion of the difficulty by an appositional construction :—

*A. R.*, 406, "I *þisse tweire* monglunge" | Mal., 110, "What be *your* ii names?" | Bullokar, *Æsop.*, 90, "*Our twooz chanc*" | Miss Muloch, *Halifax*, ii., 209, "You must let me go . . .

anywhere—out of *their* sight—*those two*" (= out of the sight of those two).

III.

**128.** Two nouns are **connected by a preposition,** *e.g.*, *father-in-law*, *the Queen of England*. In old times such word-groups were not felt as inseparable units, as they are now ; witness Chaucer, *B.*, 3870, "Ageyn Pompeius, *fader* thyn *in lawe*". Consequently, when they were to be used in the genitive, they were separated by the governing word; this was the universal practice up to the end of the fifteenth century.

Ch., *B.*, 3442, "of *kinges* blood *Of Perse* is she descended" | *B.*, 3846, "*Philippes* sone *of Macedoyne*" | *E.*, 1170, "for the *wyues* loue *of Bathe*" | *M.*, iv., 108, "That was the *kynge Priamus* sone *of Troye*" | | Malory, 45, "The *dukes* wyf *of Tyntagail*" | 127, "I am the *lordes* doughter *of this castel*" | 141, "The *kynges* sone *of Ireland*," etc.

The same construction is resorted to even in more recent times whenever the ordinary construction would present special difficulties. It is possible to denote a lady as "she in the cap," but how about the genitive case of such a group? Shakespeare says: "What's *her* name *in the cap?*" (*L. L. L.*, ii., 209)—"For *honour of former deeds'* sake" would be rather heavy ; so Milton puts it (*Sams. Ag.*, 372), "For *honour's* sake *of former deeds*". Compare also Sh., 1 *H. IV.*, iii., 2,

119, "*The Archbishops* grace *of York*" = the Archbishop of York's grace = his Grace the Archbishop of York.

**129.** But as early as Chaucer we find occasional traces of the modern construction creeping in: at least, I venture to interpret the following passages as containing it:—

*M. P.*, 3, 168, "Morpheus, and Eclympasteyre, That was *the god of slepes* heyre" (heir of the god of sleep) | *Hous of Fame*, 399, "Ovide, That hath ysowen wonder wide *The grete god of loves* name" (one MS. has "*the god of loue hys*") | *L. G. W.*, 206, "For *deyntee of the newe someres* sake I bad hem strawen floures on my bed".[1]

From the Elizabethan period the modern usage may be considered as settled and universal; Ben Jonson mentions in his *Grammar* (printed 1640, p. 72) the construction "for the *Duke's* men *of Mysia*" as existing beside that of "*the Duke of Mysia's* men"; but this may be the ordinary conservatism of grammarians, for the former construction seems to be practically never used at that time; in Wallis's *Gramm. Linguæ Anglicanæ*, 1653, p. 81, the only form mentioned is "*The King of Spain's Court*". I add here a few examples from the three last

[1] In Malory, 108, I find, "My name is Gauayne, the kyng Lott of Orkeney sone"; *s* seems here left out by a misprint (Lots? Orkeneys?); immediately after that passage the ordinary way of putting it is found: "Kyng Lots sone of Orkeney".

centuries to show the extent of the use of the modern construction :—

Marl., *Tamb.*, 645, "*The King of Perseas* crowne" | *ibid.*, 3298, "Blood is *the God of Wars* rich liuery" | Sh., *R. III.*, i., 4, 131, "*The Duke of Glousters* purse" | Swift, *Gull.*, 133, "To any village or *person of quality's* house" | Field., *T. J.*, iv., 291, "Signed with *the son of a whore's* own name" | Thc., *P.*, i., 20, "Mrs. Wapshot, *as a doctor of divinity's* lady" | *ibid.*, i., 164, "*The member of Parliament's* lady" | Carlyle, *Her.*, 2, "A man's religion is the chief fact with regard to him. A man's or *a nation of men's*" | *ibid.*, 87, "The *man of business's* faculty" | Pattison, *Milton*, 44, "Agar, who was in *the Clerk of the Crown's* office" | G. Eliot, *Life and L.*, ii., 190, "I had *a quarter of an hour's* chat with him" | Ruskin, *Select.*, i., 133, "In some *quarter of a mile's* walk" | Co. Doyle, *Study in Sc.*, 88, "I endeavoured to get *a couple of hours'* sleep" | Christina Rossetti, *Verses*, "Lo, *the King of Kings'* daughter, a high princess".

Sometimes, but very rarely indeed, an ambiguity may arise from this sort of construction, as in the well-known puzzle: "The son of Pharaoh's daughter was the daughter of Pharaoh's son".

In ordinary language the construction is found only with the preposition *of* and in the words *son-in-*

*law*,[1] etc., so also *the Commander-in-Chief's levees* (Thack., *Esmond*, i., 345) and perhaps: "for *God in Heaven's* sake". But in dialects it is used with other prepositions as well; Murray gives as Scotch (*Dial of the Southern Counties*, p. 166): "the *màn-wui-the-quheyte-cuot's* horse"; and Elworthy quotes from Somersetshire (*Gramm. of the Dial. of W. Soms.*, p. 157): *Jan Snéok uwt tu Langvurdz duung kee*, "John Snook out of Langford's donkey"; *Mr. Buurj tu Shoaldur u Muutuns paig*, "Mr. Bridge of the Shoulder of Mutton's pig".

**130.** What is the genitive of *some of them*, *any of you*, *one of us?* There is some difficulty here, and the reason of it is the same as we met with before, *viz.*, the difference between a genitive proper and a possessive pronoun, cf. § 123. In olden days, when a partitive relation could be expressed by the gen. pl., we occasionally find formations like these: *A. R.*, 204, "*hore summes* nome" (the name of some of them), where the genitive ending is tacked on to the nom., or Orrm, l. 2506, "& all onn ane wise fell till *eȝþer þeȝȝress* herrte" (to the heart of either of them), where it is added to the old gen. pl.

From more recent times, where the partitive relation has to be expressed by *of*, I have noted the

[1] It is curious to note that the gen. pl. of these words, *son-in-law*, *daughter-in-law*, etc., is avoided, although it would be one of the few instances in which there would be three different forms for the gen. sg., nom. pl. and gen. pl.: "I know all my **sons-in-law's* friends".

following instances of the possessive pronoun being used where the genitive belongs properly to the whole combination; it will be noticed that in most, though not in all cases, it does not affect the meaning of the clause whether we take the adjective, etc., as referring to the genitive or to the governing word (for "some of the men's heads" means either "some of the heads of the men," or "the heads of some of the men"):—

Malory, 79, "I maye not graunte *neyther of her* hedes" | Sh., *Tw. N.*, iii., 4, 184, "God haue mercie vpon *one of our* soules" (the soul of one of us) | *R. II.*, i., 3, 194, "Had the king permitted vs, *One of our* soules had wandred in the ayre" | 2 *H. IV.*, ii., 4, 16, "They will put on *two of our* ierkins" (the jerkins of two of us) | *T. S.*, v., 2, 171, "My mind has been as big as *one of yours*" (as that of one of you) | Drayton, *Love's Farewell*, "Be it not seen in *either of our* brows That we one jot of former love retain" | Moore, *Ir. Mel.*, "(And doth not a meeting like this) Though haply o'er *some of your* brows, as o'er mine, The snowfall of time may be stealing" | Black, *Fortunatus*, i., 183, "The hopeless resignation that had settled on *some of their* faces" | Thack., *P.*, iii., 383, "A painful circumstance which is attributable to *none of our* faults" (to the fault of none of us) | Co. Doyle, *Study in*

*Sc.*, 141, "Without meaning to hurt *either of your* feelings" | T. Hughes, *T. Brown's Schoold.*, 118, "I'm taking the trouble of writing this true history for *all of your* benefits" | Jerrold, *Caudle*, 17, "The brandy you've poured down *both of your* throats" | Stevenson, *Catriona*, 29, "For *all of our* sakes".

Dr. Murray once told me that it would be possible for a Scotchman to add the *s* to the whole of such a combination ("Is this *ony of you's?*"), and that you might even, though rarely, in colloquial English hear "This must be *some of you's*". I have some suspicion that this construction is a little less rare in colloquial language when there is a word added in apposition to *you:* "Is this *any of you children's?*"

IV.

**131.** In the case of a word **defined by a following adverb,** the old practice was to add the *s* of the genitive to the former word, and this may be found even in our times, especially when there is no governing word immediately following:—

Latroon, *Engl. Rogue*, 1665, i., 53, "I should devote myself to her service, and *nones else*" | Thack., *P.*, i., 79, "They were more in Pendennis's way than in *anybody's else*" | Mark Twain, *Mississ.*, 236, "The entire turmoil had been on Lem's account and *nobody's else*".

But in most cases the *s* is tacked on to the end of the whole group:—

"I took *somebody else's* hat" | Dick., *M. Ch.*, 372, "*Everybody else's* rights are my wrongs" | Thack., *V. F.*, 244, "On a day when *everybody else's* countenance wore the appearance of the deepest anxiety" | *Pend.*, i., 41, "Women are always sacrificing themselves or somebody for *somebody else's* sake" | *ibid.*, 304, "*Somebody else's* name" | G. Eliot, *Mill*, ii., 13, "*Somebody else's* tradesman is in pocket by somebody else" | *Fortn. Rev.*, Sept., 1877, 355, "Credulity is belief in *somebody else's* nonsense" | Ibsen, *Master Builder*, tr. by Gosse and Archer, 51, "Yes, *who else's* daughter should I be?"

Instead of the last mentioned form, some people would perhaps prefer "whose else"; Dr. Murray told me he would say "who else's baby," but "whose else" when the substantive was understood. In the following quotations both the pronoun and the adverb are inflected:—

Dick., *Christm. Books*, 59 (*Chr. Carol*), "'Don't drop that oil upon the blankets, now'. 'His blankets?' asked Joe. '*Whose else's* do you think?'" | Sketchley, *Cleopatra's Needle*, 27 (vulg.), "As if it was easy for any one to find their own needle, let alone *any one's elses*".

The only adverb besides *else* where the same con-

struction might be expected is *ever*,[1] but the genitive of *whoever* seems generally to be avoided. Mrs. Parr, however, writes (in a short story, *Peter Trotman*) :—

> "The lovely creatures in my imagination took the form of the Matilda, Julia, Fanny, or *whoever's* image at that moment filled my breast".

But some English friends have corroborated my conjecture that it would be more natural to say, *e.g.*, "It doesn't matter *whose ever* it is," than "*whoever's*," which would indeed, according to some, be impossible in this connexion; and if the elements of the word are separated, *who* of course is inflected, as in Sh., *R. III.*, iv., 4, 224, "*whose* hand *soeuer*".

V.

**132.** When one word should properly govern two or more genitives, connected by *and* or some other **conjunction**, it makes some difference whether the governing word is placed after the first or after the last of the genitives.

The former was the usual word-order in O. E., and

[1] In answer to my question: "Is the *s*-genitive of words formed like *a looker-on* ever used?" Mr. Moore Smith writes to me: "It would be possible to say, 'You've got the *chucker-out's* place,' but not 'the chucker's-out place' (*chucker-out* is slang for a man employed to turn noisy people out of a meeting); 'This is the *whipper-in's* chair'. Especially when the connexion is very close."

may still be used, especially when two distinct objects are denoted, while it is rare if the same object is meant, as in the *David Grieve* example below :—

*Oros.*, 18, 18, "þæm sciprapum þe beoð of *hwæles* hyde geworht & of *seoles*" | *Chron., A.*, 888, "*Westseaxna* ælmessan & *Ælfredes cyninges*" | *ibid.*, 901, "Butan *ðæs cyninges* leafe & his *witena*" | Ch., *L. G. W.*, 1086, "Be ye nat *Venus* sone and *Anchises?*" | Thack., *P.*, i., 16, "*Little Arthur's* figure and *his mother's*" | *ibid.*, 159, "The empty goblets and now useless teaspoons which had served to hold and mix *the captain's* liquor and *his friend's*" | *ibid.*, 217, "Affecting *Miss Costigan's* honour and *his own*" | Mrs. Humphrey Ward, *D. Grieve*, iii., 65, "In spite of *her* friendship and *Ancrum's*".

**133.** As the arrangement of the words is analogous to that mentioned above, § 119 (of *Herodes* dagum *cyninges*), we cannot wonder at finding here again in M. E. a dropping of the genitive ending in the last word, parallel to that in "*Iulianes heste the amperur*". Prof. Zupitza quotes the following instances in his edit. of *Guy of Warwick* (note to l. 688) : "*kyngys* doghtur and *emperowre*" (= a king and emperor's daughter) ; "*dewkys* doghtur and *emperowre;* for *Gyes* sowle and for *hys wyfe*" (for Guy's soul and for that of his wife). From more recent times I have noted the following passages :—

Marl., *Jew*, 278, "How, my Lord! my mony?

*Thine and the rest*" ( = that of the rest) | Sh., *Lear*, iii., 6, 101, "*His* life with *thine, and all* that offer to defend him" (=and that of all) | *L. L. L.*, v., 2, 514, "'Tis some policie To have one shew worse then the *kings and his companie*" | Byron, iv., 214, "*Thy sire's* Maker, *and the earth's and heaven's and all* that in them is" | Troll., *Duke's Ch.*, i., 82, "It is simply self-protection then? *His own and his class* (protection of himself and of his class) | Tennyson, *Foresters*, 43, "My mother, for *whose* sake *and the blessed Queen of heaven* I reverence all women".

**134.** Very nearly akin to these cases are other cases of leaving out the *s* of the last of two or more genitives; the governing word is here also understood from the first genitive; but this is farther off from the genitive without *s* than in the previous examples. Accordingly, there is more danger of ambiguity, and the construction is, therefore, now avoided. It is found in M. E.:—

Ch., *A.*, 590, "His top was dokked lyk a preest biforn" (like that of a p.) | *Guy of Warw.*, 8054, "Hys necke he made lyke no man".

Al. Schmidt has collected a good many examples of this phenomenon from Shakespeare. He considers it, however, as a rhetorical figure rather than a point of grammar; thus he writes (*Sh. Lex.*, p. 1423): "Shakespeare very frequently uses the name of a person or thing itself for a single particular

quality or point of view to be considered, in a manner which has seduced great part of his editors into needless conjectures and emendations". I pick out some of his quotations, and add a few more from my own collections :—

Sh., *Pilgr.*, 198, "*Her* lays were tuned like *the lark*" (like the lays of the lark) | *W. T.*, i., 2, 169, "He makes a *July's* day short as *December*" (as a December's day) | 2 *H. VI.*, iv., 2, 29, "*Iniquity's* throat cut like *a calf*" | *John*, ii., 486, "*Her* dowry shall weigh equal with *a queen*" | 2 *H. VI.*, iii., 2, 318, "*Mine* hair be fixed on end as *one distract*" | *Cor.*, i., 6, 27, "I know the sound of *Marcius'* tongue from *every meaner man*" | *ibid.*, iii., 2, 114, "My throat of war be turned into a pipe small as *an eunuch*" | Greene, *Friar B.*, 3, 36, "Whence are you, sir? of Suffolk? for *your* terms are finer than *the common sort of men*" | *ibid.*, 12, 47, "*Her* beauty passing Mars's *paramour*".[1]

**135.** We now come to the second possible word-order, *viz.*, that of placing the governing word after all the genitives belonging to it. In most cases the genitive ending is added to each of the genitives:

[1] In combinations such as "his capacity as a judge" we have a somewhat similar phenomenon, in so far as the common case "a judge" is referred to the genitive "his"; there is, however, the important difference that "a judge" does not stand for a genitive and cannot be replaced by "a judge's".

"She came with Tom's and John's children"; but, as a matter of fact, the *s* not unfrequently is added to the last word only, so that we have the formula (a + b) x instead of ax + bx. The earliest instance I know of is that recorded by Prof. Zupitza, *Guy*, 7715, "For *syr Gye and Harrowdes* sake". From more recent times:—

Malory, 37, "It shal be *your worship & the childis* auaille" | Marlowe, *Tamb.*, 3901, "*My lord and husbandes death*" | *ibid.*, 4123, "Is not my life and state as deere to me, *The citie and my natiue countries* weale, As any thing of price with thy conceit?" (doubtful) | Sh. *Mcb.*, v., 7, 16, "*My wife and childrens* ghosts will haunt me still" | *R. II.*, iii., 62, "All my treasurie . . . shall be *your loue and labours* recompence" | *Cor.*, v., 3, 118, "*Thy wife and childrens* blood" | *Merch.*, iii., 4, 30, "Vntill *her husband and my lords* returne" | *H VIII.*, ii., 3, 16, "Sufferance, panging As *soule and bodies* seuering" | *Sonn.*, 21, "*Earth and seas* rich gems" | Milt., *S. A.*, 181, "From *Eshtaol and Zora's* fruitful vale" | *Spectator*, No. 36, p. 60, "A widow gentlewoman, well born both by *father and mother's* side" | "A ship and a half's length" | "An hour and a half's talk" | Darwin, *Life and L.*, i., 144, "The difference he felt between *a quarter of an hour and ten minutes'* work" | S. Grand, *Twins*, 65,

"Till the bride and bridegroom's return" | Thack., *V. F.*, 169, "The rain drove into the bride and bridegroom's faces" | *ibid.*, 530, "One of the *Prince and Princess Polonia's* splendid evening entertainments" | "The Prince and Princess of Wales's pets" | G. Eliot, *Mill*, ii., 255, "In aunt and uncle Glegg's presence" | Thack., *P.*, i., 242, "Mr. and Lady Poker requested the pleasure of *Major Pendennis and Mr. Arthur Pendennis's* company" | Browning, i., 118, "To *pastor and flock's* contention" | *T. Brown's Sch.*, "The *carpenter and wheelwright's* shop" | *Waugh Tennyson*, 91, "In *Sir Theodore Martin and Professor Aytoun's 'Bon Gaultier Ballads'*".

In the following quotation the *ands* are left out :—

Byron, *Ch. Har.*, iv., 18, "And *Otway, Radcliffe, Schiller, Shakespeare's* art".

Examples with *or* and *nor* (in the last one we have both *or* and *and*) :—

Ch., *G.*, 812, "Cley maad with *hors or mannes* heer" (perhaps doubtful) | Sh., *Cor.*, v., 3, 130, "*Nor childe nor womans* face" | Byron, *Mazeppa*, 5, "*Of vassal or of knight's* degree" | Thack., *V. F.*, 360, "When I see *A. B. or W. T.'s* insufficient acts of repentance" | Darwin, *L. and L.*, ii., 41, "In *a year or two's* time" | Mrs. Ward, *R. Elsm.*, i., 215, "Returning for *an hour or two's*

rest" | *ibid.*, ii., 287, "In *a week or ten days'* time" | Stedman, *Oxford*, 190, "If only *an hour or an hour and a half's* work is left till after lunch".

In view of all these examples, it will not be easy to lay down fully definite and comprehensive rules for determining in which cases the group genitive is allowable and in which the *s* has to be affixed to each member; the group construction is, of course, easiest when one and the same name is common to two persons mentioned (*Mr. and Mrs. Brown's* compliments), or when the names form an inseparable group (*Beaumont and Fletcher's* plays; *Macmillan & Co.'s* publications). On the whole, the tendency is towards using the group genitive, wherever no ambiguity is caused by it.

**136.** With personal (*i.e.*, where the genitive case is spoken of, possessive pronouns) no such group inflexion is possible; but some difficulty arises from the difference between conjoint pronouns like *my* and absolute pronouns like *mine*. I give the sentences I have collected without any commentary:—

*a.*—(*A. R.*, 406, "Min and mines federes luue") | Sh., *Cor.*, v., 6, 4, "In *theirs* and in the commons eares" | *Tp.*, ii., 1, 253, "In *yours* and my discharge" | *Haml.*, v., 2, 341, "*Mine*[1] and my father's death come not vpon thee" | Milt., *Sams.*, 808, "*Mine* and

[1] Of course *mine* may here and in *Ado*, v., 1, 249, be the old conjoint form before a vowel; so also *thine*, *Cor.*, i., 3, 25.

love's prisoner" | Browning, iii., 36, "*Mine* and her souls" | Thack., *Esmond*, ii., 144, "He was intended to represent *yours* and her very humble servant" | Darwin, *Life and L.*, ii., 308, "Without Lyell's, *yours*, Huxley's, and Carpenter's aid".

*b.*—Carlyle, *S. R.*, 71, "To cut *your* and each other's throat" | *ibid.*, *Heroes*, 4, "*Our* and all men's sole duty" | G. Eliot, *Life*, iii., 112, "I enter into *your* and Cara's furniture-adjusting labours" | *ibid.*, iv., 18, "I received *your* and your husband's valued letters" | *ibid.*, 167, "I had heard of *your* and the professor's well-being" | *ibid.*, 266, "With a sense of *your* and Emily's trouble" | Sharp, *Browning*, 143, "On the eve of *her* and her aunt's departure" | Hales, *Longer E. Poems*, 289, "One of *their* and Pope's friends".

*c.*—Carl., *Heroes*, 97, "Turn away *your own* and others' face" | Thack., *P.*, ii., 103, "Trifle with *your own* and others' hearts" | *ibid.*, iii., 34, "I will not forget *my own* or her honour".

*d.*—Ch., *G.*, 1129, "In *your* purs or *myn*" | Mal., 92, "That knyȝte *your* enemy and *myn*" | Marl., *Jew*, 969, "For *your* sake and *his*

*owne*" | Thack., *P.*, ii., 229, "As becomes one of *your* name and *my own*" | G. Eliot, *Mill*, ii., 324, "I measured *your* love and *his* by my own".

*e*.—Ch., *M.*, iii., 194, "The wille *of me and of my wyf*" | Thack., *V. F.*, 372, "For the expenses *of herself and her little boy*" | Mrs. Ward, *R. Elsm.*, ii., 297, "The shortest way to the pockets *of you and me*" | Hardy, *Tess*, 411, "For the sake *of me and my husband*".

VI.

**137.** Finally the genitive ending may be added to **a relative clause.** Dr. Sweet, in his *New Engl. Gr.*, § 1017, mentions as an example of group-inflexion, "*the man I saw yesterday's* son,"[1] "in which the genitive ending is added to an indeclinable adverb, inflecting really the whole group, *the-man-I-saw-yesterday*". But this is generally avoided, at least in literary language; the only example I have met with in print is from the jocular undergraduate language of *Cambridge Trifles* (London, 1881), p. 140:—

"It [a brick] went into *the man who keeps below me's* saucepan".

In English dialects the phenomenon seems to be very widely spread; thus in Scotland (Murray, p.

[1] In his *Words, Logic, and Grammar*, p. 24, "*the man I saw yesterday at the theatre's* father".

166), "*The-màn-ăt-ye-mæt-yesterday's* dowchter"; in Cheshire (Darlington, *E. D. S.*, xxi., p. 55), "I've just seen *Jim Dutton, him as went to 'Meriky's weife*," = the wife of J. D., the man who went to America; in Somersetshire (Elworthy, *Gr.*, 15), "That's *the woman what was left behind's* child," *i.e.*, that is the child belonging to the woman who was left behind.

**138.** After thus passing in review all the different kinds of group genitives,[1] it remains for us to find an explanation that will account for all the facts mentioned. It is obvious that the reason of our phenomenon might

[1] In Danish the group genitive is of very frequent occurrence in nearly the same cases where it is found in English (*kongen af Danmarks* magt, *Adam og Evas* börn, etc.). In literary Swedish "*kungens* af Sverge makt," etc., is written, but the spoken language prefers "*kungen af Sverges* makt". In German only very slight traces of the group genitive are found, even such names as *Wolfram von Eschenbach* being not inflected collectively ("die gedichte Wolframs von Eschenbach"). Still in modern family names, where the combination of *von* and a name is not felt as indicating birth-place or estate, the *s* is often, though not exclusively, tacked on to the latter name; Steinthal, for instance, on one title-page writes: "Die Sprachwissenschaft W. v. Humboldt's und die Hegelsche Philosophie"; but on another, "Die Sprachphilosophischen Werke Wilhelm's von Humboldt". According to Grimm (*Deutsche Gramm.*, ii., 960) the lower classes will sometimes say "des kaiser-von-Oestreich's armee," instead of "des kaisers von Oestreich armee," but it is "rare and ignoble".

be sought either in the nature of the compound group, or in that of the ending and its function.

It might perhaps be urged that the phenomenon was due to the natural instinct taking *the Queen of England* or *King Henry the Eighth* as one inseparable whole, that would allow of no case-ending separating its several elements. The case would then be a parallel to the German treatment of those word-groups which, like *sack und pack, grund und boden*, have been fused together to the extent of making it impossible to inflect the former word and say, *e.g.*, *mit sacke und packe* or *grundes und bodens;* indeed, we here, though very rarely, may find something corresponding to the English group genitive; thus, Wieland has "des zu Abdera gehörigen *grund und bodens*".[1] But an inspection of the above collected examples will show that the explanation does not hold good; for in the majority of cases we have not only group-compounds, but also free groups[2] inflected like single words. This feeling of connectedness may

[1] Paul, *Princ. d. Sprachgesch.*, 2nd edit., p. 280.

[2] For the distinction see Sweet, *N. E. G.*, § 440: "Many word-groups resemble sentences in the freedom with which they allow one word to be substituted for another of like grammatical function, or a new word to be introduced. We call such word-groups *free groups*. Thus the free group *for my sake* can be made into *for his sake*. . . . But in such groups as *son-in-law*, *man-of-war*, *bread-and-butter*, *cup-and-saucer*, no such variation is possible, the order of the elements of these groups being as rigidly fixed as in a compound word. We call such combinations *group-compounds*."

have gone for something in the development of the modern word-order where the genitive of *the Queen of England* is placed before the governing noun, instead of the old "the Queen's crown of England"; and it undoubtedly plays some part in the cases mentioned in § 135 (A and B's); but it gives no satisfactory explanation of the difference between the plural *the Queens of England* and the genitive *the Queen of England's*.

**139.** As the nature of the group fails to give an answer to our question we turn our attention to the ending, and the first thing that strikes us is that we find no trace of the group genitive with any of the O. E. genitive endings *-a, -ra, -an, -e, -re,* etc. (cf. § 25) but only with *-(e)s*. It is not till this ending has practically superseded all the other ways of forming the genitive that our phenomenon begins to make its appearance. In other words, the first condition of forming genitives of whole groups as if they were single words is that the manner of formation of genitives should be on the whole uniform. Where the genitive is formed irregularly, as is now only the case with the personal pronouns, we have had until the present day only rudimentary and feeble attempts at group genitives.

**140.** Now, if we were to ask: What is the reason of this regularity in the formation of English noun genitives? then any student that is at all acquainted with modern linguistic theories and methods would be out with the answer: "Why, it is due to analogy;

the *s*-ending has gradually been extended to the whole of the vocabulary, the analogy of those nouns which had an *s*-genitive in O. E. prevailing over the others".

Very good; the answer is obviously correct. And yet it is not entirely satisfactory, for it does not account for the difference observable in many words between the formation of the genitive and that of the plural. In the latter, too, the *s*-ending has been analogically extended in pretty much the same way as in the former; but how is it that we so often see the irregular plural preserved, whereas the genitive is always regular? We have the irregular plurals *men*, *children*, *oxen*, *geese*, etc., as against the regular genitives *man's*, *child's*, *ox's*, *goose's*, etc. In the days of Chaucer and Shakespeare the plural and the genitive of most words ending in *f*, *e.g.*, *wife* and *life*, were identical, *wives* and *lives* being said in both cases; why has the analogy of the nom. sg. been more powerful in the genitive (modern *wife's*, *life's*) than in the plural?

The only explanation, as far as I can see, lies in the different function of the two endings; if we put a singular word into the plural, the change affects this word only; its relation to the rest of the proposition remains the same. But if, on the other hand, we put a word in the genitive case which was in the nominative, we change its syntactical relation completely; for the function of a genitive is that of closely connecting two words.

**141.** There is yet another thing to be noted. The O. E. genitive had many different functions; we may broadly compare its syntax to that of the Latin genitive. We find in Old English possessive, partitive, objective, and descriptive genitives; genitives governed by various adjectives and verbs, etc. And the position of the genitive is nearly as free as it is in Latin. But if you will take the trouble to read a few pages of any Old English prose book, of the Anglo-Saxon chronicle, of King Alfred, or of Ælfric, you will soon observe that where the Old English genitive might be rendered by a genitive in Modern English, it nearly always precedes its noun; where the word-order is different, the old genitive construction has, in the majority of cases, been abandoned. It is a significant fact that the only surviving use of the English genitive is a prepositive one; the word-order "the books my friend's" for "my friend's books" is, and has been for many centuries, as impossible in English as it is frequent in German: "die bücher meines freundes".

**142.** We are now in a position to draw our conclusions. The *s* is always wedged in between the two words it serves to connect; it is, accordingly, felt as belonging nearly as much to the word following it as to the preceding one. Nay, it is now more important that the *s* should come immediately before the governing word than that it should come immediately after the noun which it turns into a genitive case. It is now partly a suffix as of old, partly a

prefix; if we were allowed to coin a new word we should term it an *interposition.*

This peculiar development gives us the clue to the problems mentioned above. If the *s* of the genitive is more loosely connected with the word it belongs to than is the *s* (or other suffix) of the plural, that is the reason why it tolerates no change in the body of the word: the old plural *wives* may remain; but the genitive (originally *wives* also) must be made to agree with the nominative—and so it becomes *wife's.*[1]

And we now see clearly why such groups as *the Queen of England,* when put in the genitive, affix the *s* to the last word of the group, but when put in the plural, to the first.

**143.** Let us look again at some of the above examples; they will enable us to formulate the following three rules:—

When the governing word follows immediately after the genitive, the *s* is never left out;

But this is very frequently the case when the governing word is placed elsewhere (or is understood);

Whenever the *s* is taken from the word to which it should properly belong (according to the old grammar) and shifted on to some other word, this

[1] In the present orthography, too, the gen. is brought nearer to the spelling of the nom. sg. than the nom. pl. is: gen. *lady's, church's,* but pl. *ladies, churches;* Shakespeare and Addison would write *ladies* and *churches* for both forms.

latter is always followed immediately by the governing word.

Compare, for instance :—

| | |
|---|---|
| (O. E.) *anes reades* monnes blod ... ... ... ... | (Mod.) *a red* man's blood |
| (M. E.) Julianes heste þe *amperur* ... ... ... | (Mod.) the *Emperor* Julian's command |
| (M. E.) the *kinges* meting Pharao ... ... ... | (Mod.) *King* Pharao's dream |
| at Smith's the *bookseller*['s] ... | at Smith the *bookseller*'s office |
| (Ch.) for your *bothes* peyne ... | for *both* your pains |
| (Ch.) kinges blood of *Perse* ... | (Marlowe) the King of *Perseas* crowne |
| *anybody's* else ... ... ... | anybody *else's* hat |
| (it does not matter *whose* ever it is) ... ... ... ... | (*whoever's* image) |
| (M. E.) kyngys doghtur and emperowre ... ... ... | (Mod.) a king and emperor's daughter |
| (Sh.) Her lays were tuned like *the lark* ... ... ... | they were tuned like *the lark's* lays |
| (his father is richer than the *man's* we met yesterday[1]) | (he is richer than the *man* we met yesterday's father) |

**144.** Now, let us sum up the history of the genitive ending *s*.

In the oldest English it is a case-ending like any other found in flexional languages; it forms together with the body of the noun one indivisible whole, in which it is often impossible to tell where the kernel of the word ends and the ending begins (compare

[1] I have placed those sentences within parentheses which have only a theoretical interest, as neither playing nor having played any noticeable part in natural speech.

*endes* from *ende* and *heriges* from *here*); the ending is only found in part of the vocabulary, many other genitive endings being found elsewhere.

As to syntax, the meaning and the function of these genitive endings are complicated and rather vague; and there are no fixed rules for the position of the genitive in the proposition.

In course of time we witness a gradual development towards greater regularity and precision. The partitive, objective, descriptive and some other functions of the genitive become obsolete; the genitive is invariably put immediately before the word or words it governs: irregular forms disappear, the *s*-ending only surviving as the fittest, so that at last we have one definite ending with one definite function and one definite position. If the syntactical province of the genitive has been narrowed in course of time, the loss—if such it be—has been compensated, and more than compensated, as far as the *s*-ending is concerned, by its being now the sole and absolute sovereign of that province; its power is no longer limited to some masculine and neuter nouns nor to one number only; it rules irrespective of gender and number.

**145.** In an Old English genitive the main ("full") word and the case-forming element are mutually dependent on each other, not only in such genitives as *lufe* or *suna* or *bec* or *dohtor*, but also in the more regular formations in *-es;* one part cannot be separated from the other, and in the case of several words belonging

together, each of them has to be put in the genitive case: *anes reades mannes | þære godlican lufe | ealra godra ealdra manna weorc*, etc.

In Modern English, on the other hand, the *s* is much more independent: it can be separated from its main word by an adverb such as *else*, by a prepositional clause such as *of England* or even by a relative clause such as *I saw yesterday;* and one *s* is sufficient after such groups as *a red man* or *all good old men*. If, therefore, the chief characteristic of flexional languages, such as Greek and Hebrew, is inseparableness of the constituting elements, it will be seen that the English genitive is in fact no longer a flexional form; the *s* is rather to be compared with those endings in agglutinating languages like Magyar, which cause no change in the words they are added to, and which need only be put once at the end of groups of words;[1] or to the so-called empty words of Chinese grammar. Our present nineteenth century orthography half indicates the independence of the element by separating it from the body of the preceding noun by an apostrophe; there would be no great harm done if the twentieth century were to go the whole length and write, *e.g.*, *my father s house*,

[1] Professor Vilh. Thomsen, in his lectures on the Science of Language some ten years ago, used to illustrate the principle of agglutination by a comparison with the Danish genitive ending *s*, which is in many respects analogous to the English ending.

*the Queen of England s power, somebody else s hat*, etc.[1] Compare also Thackeray's lines (*Ballads*, p. 64):—

He lay his cloak upon a branch,
To guarantee his Lady Blanche
's delicate complexion.

It is important to notice that here historically attested facts show us in the most unequivocal way a development—not, indeed, from an originally self-existent word to an agglutinated suffix and finally to a mere flexional ending, but the exactly opposite development of what was *an inseparable part of a complicated flexional system to greater and greater emancipation and independence.*

## APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VIII.

### "BILL STUMPS *HIS* MARK," ETC.

**146.** The tendency to turn the genitive ending into an independent word meets with, and is to a certain degree strengthened by, a phenomenon that has originally nothing to do with it; I mean, the **expression of a genitive relation by a common case plus a possessive pronoun.** The best known instance of this is "for *Jesus Christ his* sake" in the Common Prayer Book.

[1] It is true that this spelling would perhaps in some cases suggest a false pronunciation, for *phonetically* the ending still belongs to the preceding rather than to the following word, as its triple pronunciation [s, z, iz, § 151] is determined by the final sound of the former.

This peculiar idiom is not confined to English: it is extremely common in Danish, Norwegian and Swedish dialects, in Middle and Modern Low German, in High German (Goethe . " Ist doch keine menagerie So bunt wie *meiner Lili ihre !*"), in Magyar, etc. In English the phenomenon has been noticed by many grammarians ;[1] and if any one wishes to see other or more instances than those from which I have tried to form an idea of the origin and character of the idiom, it is to their works that I must refer him.

**147.** In most cases the phenomenon is a form of that anacoluthia which I have already had occasion to mention (see § 60), and which consists in the speaker or writer beginning his sentence without thinking exactly of the proper grammatical construction of the word that first occurs to him, so that he is subsequently obliged to use a correcting pronoun. As this want of forethought is common everywhere and at all times, we find the grammatical irregularity in many languages,[2] and it is naturally very frequent when a lengthy clause is introduced: it is also often

[1] Mätzner, *Grammatik*, iii., 236; Fr. Koch, *Gramm.*, ii., 249; Abbott, *Shak. Gr.*, § 217; Storm, *Engl. Philol.*, 1881, 262; Einenkel, *Streifzüge*, 109, and Paul's *Grundriss*, i., 909; Kellner, *Blanch.*, xxxvi., and *Hist. Outl. of Engl. Syntax*, § 308; Franz, *Engl. Studien*, xvii., 388.

[2] One French example from Bourget, *Cruelle Enigme*, 18: "*Elles* qui vivaient dans une simplicité de veuves sans espérance, et qui n'auraient pour rien au monde modifié quoique ce fût à l'antique mobilier de l'hôtel, *leur* sentiment pour Hubert leur avait soudain révélé le luxe et le comfort moderne".

resorted to where a foreign name is introduced that does not conform to the native declensions.

The possessive pronoun is often, for some reason or other, separated from its antecedent :—

*A. R.*, 82, "*þe þet* swuch fulðe speteð ut in eni ancre eare me schulde dutten *his* muð" | Ch., *L. G. W.*, 2180, "*Thise false lovers*, poison be *hir* bane!" | *M. P.*, v., 99, "*The wery hunter*, sleping in his bed, To wode again *his* mynde goth anon" | Sh., *R. III.*, iii., 2, 58, and *Wint. T.*, iii., 2, 98, quoted in § 60 | *R. III.*, i., 4, 217, "Alas! for whose sake did I that ill deed? For *Edward*, for *my brother*, for *his* sake."

But we are here chiefly concerned with those cases in which the possessive pronoun followed immediately on its antecedent :—

*Oros.*, 8, "*Asia & Europe hiera* landgemircu togædre licgað . . . *Affrica & Asia hiera* landgemircu onginnað of Alexandria" | *ibid.*, 12, "*Nilus seo éa hire* æwielme is neh þæm clife þære Readan Sæs" | Malory, 126, "This lord of this castel his name is syr Damas, and he is the falsest knyght that lyueth" | Sh., *Tp.*, v., 1, 268, "*This mishapen knaue, his* mother was a witch" | Scott, *Lay of the Last Minst.*, i., 7, "But *he, the chieftain of them all, His* sword hangs rusting on the wall" | Rossetti, *Poet. W.*, 164, "For *every man on God's ground*, O King, *His* death grows up from

his birth" | Tennyson, 616, "*The great tragedian*, that had quenched herself In that assumption of the bridesmaid, she that loved me, *our true Edith, her* brain broke with over acting".[1]

Ch., *M.*, iii., 145, "For sothly *he that precheth to hem that liste not to heere his wordes, his* sermoun hem anoyeth" | Num., xvii., 5 (Revised Version), "It shall come to pass, that *the man whom I shall choose, his* rod shall bud" (Auth. Vers. . . . "that the man's rod whom I shall choose, shall blossom").

The similarity between this sentence from the Revised Version and "the man I saw yesterday's father" is conspicuous.

**148.** There are, however, other sources from which this genitive construction by means of possessive pronouns may arise. First I shall mention what Einenkel thinks the sole origin of it, *viz.*, the construction after some verbs meaning to *take* or *rob*, where a dative + a possessive pronoun very nearly amounts to the same thing as a gen., as will be seen in the following instances:—

*A. R.*, 286, "þet tu wult . . . reauen *God his* strencðe" | *ibid.*, 300, "Schrift reaueð *þe*

[1] A curious example with the pronoun of the first person is Sh., *Tp.*, i., 2, 109, "*Me* (*poore man*) *my* Librarie was dukedome large enough"; if we do not here take *me* as a dative = *to me*, we have something like an apology for the missing genitive *a* of "*I poor man*," cf. § 123.

*ueonde his* lond" | Malory, 110, "Syr Tor alyghte and toke *the dwarf his* glayue".

But even if we include in this rule other verbs of a kindred nature, as in :—

*A. S. Chron., A.*, 797, "Her Romane *Leone þæm papan his* tungon forcurfon & his eagan astungon,"

the instances of this particular construction are not numerous enough to account for the frequency of the *his*-genitive. Language is here, as elsewhere, too complex for us to content ourselves with discovering the source of one of the brooklets that go to forming a big river. Looking round for other sources we see that other verbs as well as "rob," etc., may be followed by a dative + *his*, nearly equivalent to a genitive (*to ask a man his pardon* is nearly equivalent to *asking a man's pardon*) ; compare also the following examples, in none of which a substitution of a genitive for the dative + the possessive pronoun would involve a change in the meaning :—

*A. R.*, 84, "He mid his fikelunge & mid his preisunge heleð & wrihð *mon his* sunne" (he with his flattery and with his praise concealeth and covereth from man (for a man) his sin = conceals a man's sin) | Byron, v., 260 (*Sardanap.*, iv., 1), "and there at all events secure *My nephews and your sons their* lives" | Hughes, *Tom Br.*, 5, "There is enough of interest and beauty to last *any reasonable man his* life" | Tennyson, 372,

"*Merlin* . . . had built *the king his* havens, ships, and halls".

**149.** In yet other instances it is a nominative that combines with *his* to form our quasi-genitive. When we read in Chaucer manuscripts, for instance :—

"Heer beginnith the *Chanouns yeman his tale*,"

Prof. Skeat finds it necessary to warn us: "The rubric means, 'Here the *Canon's Yeoman* begins his tale'. The word *tale* is not to be taken as a nominative case." But it will be observed that it does not matter much for the understanding of the phrase as a whole whether we take it as a nominative or an accusative; Prof. Skeat may be right in thinking that in these rubrics *begin* was originally a transitive verb; but as in most other mediæval rubrics *begin* was taken intransitively (the subject being the title of the book), an analogous interpretation would naturally present itself in instances like the above, and then *yeman his* would be the equivalent of a genitive before *tale*. That some, at least, of the old scribes were not of Prof. Skeat's opinion, appears from the rubric found in MS. Arch. Seld., B, 114:—

"Here endith the man of lawe his tale. And next *folwith the shipman his* prolog."

For it is here out of the question to construe, "And next the shipman follows his prologue;" this, then, is undoubtedly an instance of the *his*-genitive.

**150.** Sprung as it is, then, from various sources, this makeshift genitive now converges with and meets

the originally totally different interpositional descendant from the old flexional *s*-genitive, so that the two formations become often practically indistinguishable.[1] The similarity is of a purely phonetic nature; *his* would, of course, be pronounced with weak stress, and in unstressed words in the middle of a sentence *h* is scarcely if at all audible (as in the rapid pronunciation of "he took *his* hat," etc.; compare also *it* for older *hit*, and *'s* for *has*). Thus, *þe bissop his broþer*, etc., in the B-text of Layamon, may be only another way of writing *bissopis* or *bissopes*.[2]

**151.** When, in the fifteenth century or so, most of the weak *e*'s disappeared in pronunciation, the genitive ending *-es* [-iz] was differentiated into the three forms which it still has:—

[s] after voiceless sounds (bishop's);
[z] after voiced sounds (king's), and
[iz] after hisses (prince's).

But the same change happened with the possessive pronoun, as will be seen very frequently in Shakespeare:—

*All's*, ii., 2, 10, "Put *off's* cap, *kiss his* hand" | *Cor.*, ii., 2, 160, "May they *perceiue's* intent" | *ibid.*, ii., 3, 160, "*At's* heart" | 171, "*For's*

[1] Compare such accidental convergings of not-related words as that of *sorrow* and *sorry*.

[2] Perhaps we have *Venus his* written for *Venuses* in Ch., *M. P.*, 4, 31, "The thridde hevenes lord (Mars) . . . hath wonne Venus his love"; or is *his love* = "his beloved one," in apposition to Venus?

countrey" | v., 3, 159, "*To's* mother" | *Meas.*, i., 4, 74, "*For's* execution," etc. | | Marlowe, *Jew*, 1651, "*on's* nose" (cf. A. Wagner's note to his edit. of the same play, 294).

Compare the treatment of the verbal form *is: that's, there's, this is.* In Elizabethan English, *it* was treated similarly. I *saw't, for't, do't, upon't, done't*, etc. So also *us* (comp. mod. *let's*): *upon's, among's, upbraid's, behold's*, etc.

**152.** Here I add a few examples of the *his*-genitive from Chaucer down to the vulgar speech or burlesque style of our days:—

Ch., *L. G. W.*, 2593, "*Mars his* venim is adoun" | Sh., *Haml.*, ii., 2, 512, "Neuer did the Cyclop hammers fall On *Mars his* armours" | *Tw. N.*, iii., 3, 26, "'Gainst the *Count his* gallies" | 2 *H. IV.*, ii., 4, 308, "Art not thou *Poines his* brother?" | *L. L. L.*, v., 2, 528, "A man of *God his* making" (folio: God's) | Thack., *Pend.*, ii., 6 (a housekeeper says), "In *George the First his* time" | Gilbert, *Bab Ball.*, 36, "Seven years I wandered—Patagonia, China, Norway, Till at last I sank exhausted At a *pastrycook his* doorway".

**153.** To the popular feeling the two genitives were then identical, or nearly so: and as people could not take the fuller form as originating in the shorter one, they would naturally suppose the *s* to be a shortening

of *his*; this is accordingly a view that we often find either adopted or contested, as will appear from the following quotations, which might easily be augmented :—

HUME, *Orthographie*, 1617, ed. by Wheatley, p. 29, "This s sum haldes to be a segment of his, and therfoer now almost al wrytes his for it as if it were a corruption. But it is not a segment of his : 1. because his is the masculin gender, and this may be foeminin ; as, A mother's love is tender ; 2. because his is onelie singular, and this may be plural ; as, al men's vertues are not knawen."

MAITTAIRE, *Eng. Gr.*, 1712, p. 28, "The genitive . . . is expressed by -s at the end of the word : as, *the childrens bread, the daughters husband, its glory*. The *s*, if it stands for *his*, may be marked by an apostrophus : *e.g.*, for Christ's sake : and sometimes *his* is spoken and written at length, *e.g.*, *for Christ his sake*."

ADDISON, *Spect.*, No. 135, "The same single letter [s] on many occasions does the office of a whole word, and represents the *his* and *her* of our forefathers. There is no doubt but the ear of a foreigner, which is the best judge in this case, would very much disapprove of such innovations, which indeed we do ourselves in some measure, by retain-

ing the old termination in writing, and in all the solemn offices of our religion." [1]

ENQUIRE WITHIN, 1885, § 208, "The apostrophe (') is used to indicate the combining of two words in one, as *John's book*, instead of *John, his book*".

In its struggle for an independent existence, the *s*-interposition seemed likely to derive great assistance from the concurrence of the *his*-construction. But the coincidence was not to last long. On the one hand, the contraction of the weak *his* seems to have been soon given up, the vowel being reintroduced from the fully stressed form, even where the *h* was dropped (*he took 'is hat*); on the other hand, the limited signification of the possessive pronoun counteracted the complete fusion which would undoubtedly have taken place, if *his* had been common to all genders and to both numbers, instead of being confined to the masc. (and in former centuries the neuter) sg. A formation like "Pallas her glass" (quoted by Abbott from Bacon) does not fit in with the rest of the system of the language, and "Pallas his glass" would jar upon English ears because *his* is too much felt as a pronoun denoting sex.

[1] This remark of Addison's gives us the clue to the retention of "for Jesus Christ his sake" in the Prayer Book; it is no doubt the old syllabic ending *Christes* remained unaltered after the *e* had generally become silent, on account of the accustomed rhythmic enunciation; a better way of spelling it would therefore be *Christès* as in *blessèd*, etc.

ABERDEEN: THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

14 5504

RETURN TO ➔ **CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT**
198 Main Stacks

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| LOAN PERIOD 1 **HOME USE** | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 5 | 6 |

**ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS.**
**Renewls and Recharges may be made 4 days prior to the due date.**
**Books may be Renewed by calling 642-3405.**

**DUE AS STAMPED BELOW**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| APR 19 1999 | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

FORM NO. DD6

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
BERKELEY, CA 94720-6000

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES

C040156481